

**EVALUATION OF THE SPARK CURRICULUM  
IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN  
ZAMBIA, 2000 – 2004**

**By**

**Dr. Yizenge A.Chondoka  
Lead Consultant**

**Mr Charles Subulwa  
Consultant**

**Project Sponsors: UNICEF, Zambia Office**

**September 2004**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	iii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	iv
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	v
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	4
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b> .....	6
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: TEACHERS, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	7
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: PUPILS, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	11
<b>CHAPTER SIX: SKILLS CLASS, SKILLS TRAINING AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	13
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	14
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT: PARENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY SCHOOL</b> .....	15
<b>CHAPTER NINE: INTERACTIVE RADIO INSTRUCTION, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	16
<b>CHAPTER TEN: SPARK CURRICULUM, PRIMARY READING PROGRAMME, MULTIGRADE AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	19
<b>CHAPTER ELEVEN: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMME</b> .....	20
<b>CHAPTER TWELVE: COST OF IMPLEMENTING FULL SPARK CURRICULUM IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	22
<b>CHAPTER THIRTEEN: CO-OPERATING PARTNERS AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS</b> .....	25
<b>CHAPTER FOURTEEN: FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE SPARK CURRICULUM IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN ZAMBIA</b> .....	25
<b>CHAPTER FIFTEEN: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY</b> .....	28
<b>APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED</b> .....	30
<b>APPENDIX 2: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS</b> .....	35
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS</b> .....	35
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS/COMMUNITY</b> .....	37
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNERS SUPPORTING COMMUNITY SCHOOLS (ZOCS, BOCS (Kabwe), CHURCH ORGANISATIONS AND NGOs)</b> .....	38
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS</b> .....	39
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROVINCIAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL CO-ORDINATOR/FOCAL POINT PERSON</b> .....	43
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROVINCIAL MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OFFICIAL</b> .....	44
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION DISTRICT OFFICIAL AND RESOURCE CENTRE CO-ORDINATORS</b> .....	45
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IRI SCHOOLS/CENTRES MENTORS</b> .....	46
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IRI SCHOOL/CENTRE GRADE 4/5 PUPILS</b> .....	48
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NON-SPARK COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: TEACHERS</b> .....	49
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL TEACHERS</b> .....	50
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON FULL COST OF IMPLEMENTING SPARK</b> .....	51
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EBS (MOE) OFFICIAL ON IRI SCHOOL/CENTRE</b> .....	52
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRP</b> .....	53
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRP</b> .....	54
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MULTIGRADE TEACHING METHODOLOGIES</b> .....	55
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MULTIGRADE TEACHING METHODOLOGIES</b> .....	56
<b>APPENDIX 3: REPORT ON THE FIELD ASSESSMENT</b> .....	56
<b>APPENDIX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....	57
<b>APPENDIX 5: ACRONYMS</b> .....	59
<b>APPENDIX 6: BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	61

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Many people assisted us in the preparation of this report. We register our sincere thanks to all the participants we interviewed in the study areas for their wonderful reception and co-operation. Special thanks go to Mr. Christopher Syamwenya and Mr. C. M. Chilindi former Ministry of Education Community Schools Focal Point Persons for Southern and Copperbelt Provinces respectively. They worked with us throughout the time we spent in their districts. Without their co-operation it was going to be extremely difficult to find the community schools in the study areas. Ms Loveness Mubisi, the Education Standards Officer for Kafue district deserves special thanks for agreeing to take us round the community schools in her district including a government school, Nankanga, 45 kilometres southeast of Lusaka in the Nankanga hills. Without the timely co-operation of Mr. Nchimunya of Luangwa District Office, it was going to be very difficult to visit remote community schools on the banks of the Zambezi and Luangwa Rivers. Last but not least, we are grateful to the officials of the Ministry of Education both at District and Provincial offices in the study areas of Masati; Kabwe, Lusaka, Chongwe, Luangwa, Kafue, Mazabuka and Livingstone districts for the wonderful reception they accorded to us.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **BACKGROUND**

Since the formation of the Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS) in 1996 to monitor and co-ordinate the activities of community schools in the country, a series of studies have been undertaken on a number of issues relating to the operations and functions of community schools. However, to date there has been no comprehensive evaluation of community school curriculum. The purpose of this particular study was to assess the suitability, relevance, effectiveness and impact of the SPARK curriculum in community schools in Zambia from 2000 to 2004.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The study utilised both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. For qualitative methodologies, views were obtained from the participants, namely, teachers, current and former pupils; parents in the Parent Community School Committees (PCSCs); representatives of local and international Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) and co-operating partners. Quantitative research methodology was employed specifically to obtain statistical data.

Vast amounts of primary data were collected by interviewing participants either in Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) or individually. Male and female teachers were interviewed together and, male and female pupils were also interviewed in-groups. Parents in the PCSC were also interviewed together in a mixed gender group. Interviews with co-operating partners in Lusaka who directly or indirectly support SPARK community schools were very enriching indeed.

Substantial primary data were also collected using questionnaires developed by the consultants and checked by UNICEF, the sponsors and the Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS), representing the Ministry of Education (MOE). Each category of respondents had its own questionnaire. For details on categories of the Study Instruments and various target groups see Appendix C. Considerable secondary data were also collected from documents obtained from Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS) office, Zambia Open Community Schools (ZOCS) office, and UNICEF library.

## KEY FINDINGS

As per the Terms of Reference data were collected from three *main* districts, namely, Masaiti in Ndola, Mazabuka and Livingstone. The consultants also went to Luangwa, Chongwe, Mpongwe and Kafue districts.

The following were the key findings of the study:

1. As the SPARK curriculum stands today, it is only partially relevant and it is not suitable for the learning needs of the pupils in the community schools in the country. There are many reasons for this. First, the SPARK curriculum depends on only one document, the SPARK manual for delivery of lessons by teachers. In itself, the manual is not adequate. Second, the curriculum was suitable for the original target group of children above 9 years. In the initial stages the SPARK curriculum was relevant and suitable for the dominant older children for whom the curriculum was originally meant. However, from 2000 the population of older children dwindled and more younger children entered community schools rendering the curriculum ineffective, not suitable and not relevant to the needs of the new-look community schools children. Current age profile in community schools in the study area is from 6 – 8 years at Level 1. This is shown in Table 4 in Chapter Four, where it is revealed that there are more younger children of school age or age range of 7 to 14 years entering community schools than the older children of age range 9 to 16 years for which community schools were initially intended. Thirdly, the non-availability of the SPARK manual in some community schools forced the teachers to follow the ZBEC curriculum. From the fieldwork and archival sources, it has been established that only 10% of the community schools are meant to be ‘SPARK curriculum community schools’, following the SPARK curriculum. The rest, or 90% of the community schools are using the Zambia Basic Education (ZBEC) curriculum.
2. Parent Community School Committees (PCSCs), teachers and pupils in community schools would like the SPARK curriculum and SPARK manual revised and extended from the current Levels 1 to 4 (Grades 1 to 7) to Grades 8 and 9. This means that they would like community schools to offer education up to the Upper Basic School level. The revised and extended version should incorporate more material in the subject areas that are required for entry into Grade 8 to be at par with the government curriculum for Grades 1 to 7. The revised and extended version of the SPARK curriculum and SPARK manual will not only attract more community schoolteachers to use it more effectively but the incorporated materials and pupils’ books will enhance the delivery of lessons. This is clearly a reflection of a change in the philosophy of community schools in the country. It is also a reflection of a change of expectations by the *three main* stakeholders: parents, pupils and teachers as observed in the study area and documented in chapters 4, 5 and 8.
3. On its own, the current SPARK curriculum is not effective in adequately providing the present learning needs of the learners in the SPARK community schools. The ineffectiveness lies in the inadequate content in the syllabus

(SPARK manual) as compared to the ZBEC yet the same community school children are also expected to sit the same Grade 7 examination as those taught on the ZBEC curriculum. Also, 24 out of 33 of the teachers in this survey, the users of the SPARK curriculum are not qualified to handle the SPARK manual because they have not been inducted or trained in its use. Community schools do not have their own Teacher Training College where to train their community schoolteachers. Additionally, lecturers in the government Teacher Training Colleges where community school teachers are trained are themselves not trained in SPARK curriculum teaching methodologies. Therefore, the trained teachers coming out of these Colleges are not competent to handle learners in the SPARK community schools. The curriculum in government Teacher Training Colleges where community school teachers train does not include community school concepts or teaching strategies or methodologies, hence the training is irrelevant to community school needs in their original conception. Teachers in the SPARK community schools do not have supplementary learning and teaching materials such as a Pupils' Book based on the revised SPARK manual and reference books for teachers to enhance teaching. Also, in the study areas visited, there is no community school that has a Skills Class for the Level 4 graduates. Pupils who do not succeed in the Grade 7 government examinations to proceed to Grade 8, go back to their communities and eventually return to life in the village. For those in urban areas, they return to the streets. The content of the original SPARK curriculum was for the older children of the age range 9 to 16 years. Data from fieldwork as tabulated in Table 4 reveal that the same curriculum is now directed at the younger children of age range 7 to 14 years. One of the consequences of the inability of this curriculum is *its* failure to sufficiently facilitate provision of learning needs for the 'young age range' community school children or *its* failure to sufficiently facilitate entry of the 'young age range' community school children to Grade 8 in government schools. The small number of community school pupils entering Grade 8 is shown in Table 5. Having recognised the ineffectiveness of the SPARK curriculum, some of the teachers in the SPARK community schools are unofficially using it together with the government ZBEC curriculum as a strategy to improve learning of the pupils. Other schools are using it with IRI. Table 3 illustrates this point very well. Of the *12 community schools* visited in the study area, 4 community schools are SPARK community schools; 6 community schools are Non-SPARK community schools; One community school is following *both* the *IRI* and *SPARK manual*; 3 community schools are following ZBEC only, and 2 community schools are following *both ZBEC and SPARK curricular*.

4. The impact of SPARK curriculum has not been positive in the **10%** community schools using the SPARK curriculum. This is because teachers, especially the untrained teachers do not find it user-friendly. The English language used in the SPARK manual is technical and at a higher level than the level of education for the teachers. This makes the manual not easy to be understood by many untrained community schoolteachers. Also, many community schoolteachers are not inducted in the use of the SPARK manual.

5. The cost for implementing the full SPARK curriculum community school varies between urban and rural areas. The average cost for the urban school is about K110,000 per learner per annum while that for the rural school is about K90,000 per pupil per year.
6. There is no Primary Reading Programme (PRP) in community schools.
7. There is an excellent relationship between SPARK curriculum and the Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI) in community schools visited in the study areas. It is also true for the community schools in Lusaka and Mumbwa districts as disclosed by the EBS officials. The teachers in the IRI - SPARK community schools that the research team visited use IRI in addition to the SPARK manual. In terms of teaching methodology, the IRI re-enforces the materials in the SPARK manual. The strong educational bond between the two has benefited many community schoolteachers, who have been trained by EBS in the use of the IRI teaching methodologies.
8. ZCSS teacher training programmes for its teachers between 2000 and 2004 have had little impact in the community schools. The schools we visited in the study area during the fieldwork presented in Table 10 in Chapter Eleven, only 9 out of 33 of the teachers are trained and 24 out of 33 of the teachers interviewed are untrained. They have never been inducted in the use of the SPARK curriculum and they have not been to any government Teacher Training College either.
9. As of now much data on community schools are neither systematically stored nor sufficiently detailed. There are gaps in the data on community schools at ZCSS. For example, there are no data pertaining to the number of Skills Classes, accurate number of registered community schools, data on all pupils by gender who qualify to enter Grade 8 annually, or data on the general post-Level 4 activities that pupils from SPARK community schools are engaged in.
10. Pupils in community schools who qualify to enter Grades 8 and 10 experience difficulties to acquire money for school requirements.

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings presented in the foregoing paragraphs, we recommend that:

1. The present SPARK curriculum and SPARK manual should be *phased out*. The ‘phasing out’ period should be one year beginning 2005. Other than literacy, numeracy and oracy mainly in local languages, most objectives of the SPARK curriculum in the SPARK curriculum community schools have not been achieved as explained in the *Introduction* of this report. For example, originally, the SPARK curriculum schools were not meant to enrol children under 9 years and the children were not meant to write Grade 7 examinations after Level 4, but to enter the Skills Class. However, from the fieldwork undertaken in the study area and the accompanying statistical data in Table 4 in Chapter Four and Table 5 in Chapter

Five it is clear that children under 9 years of age are being enrolled and those in Level 4 write Grade 7 examinations. There are no Skills Classes for Level 4 graduates. All these confirm that most of the objectives, original policy and original philosophy have not been fulfilled in the SPARK curriculum community schools.

2. The existing bursary scheme in the Ministry of Education should be extended to the community school pupils who qualify to enter Grades 8 and 10. The children are from disadvantaged economic backgrounds and will not be able to raise the fees and other requisites for the government Upper Basic school that they originally avoided in the Lower and Middle Basic school.
3. In view of the first recommendation above, it is therefore not necessary to prepare a revised SPARK curriculum incorporating some of the content in the Upper Basic school syllabus as demanded by the Parent Community School Committees, community schoolteachers and community school pupils. The ZBEC curriculum should be adopted by the 10% community schools currently using the SPARK curriculum.
4. Since practical skills are crucial for the future of children in the community schools, we strongly recommend that unlike the current situation where the research team did not find a community school in the study area with Skills Classes, Skills Classes should be established for graduates of Level 4 and Grade 9 and this should be optional for the pupils. The Skills Classes should be situated in carefully selected Provincial Zonal Centres and should be equipped with the necessary tools and qualified Industrial Arts teachers, Agricultural science teachers and Home Economics teachers. Alternatively, arrangements should be made with St. Paul's Skills Training College in Mazabuka to admit more students from community schools all over the country. This will require financial and technical assistance to expand the College.
5. ZCSS in collaboration with EBS should organise Training Workshops for Lecturers in the government Teacher Training Colleges on the teaching methodologies specific to *all* community schools and the use of the Mentor's Guide (manual) and the operations of the IRI Learning at Taonga Market Educational Radio Programme. The supplementary community school teaching methodologies should be mandatory for trainee teachers from community schools.
6. ZCSS should institute short researches/consultancies to gather essential data on various aspects of community schools that are currently not available at the Secretariat as stated in the *Finding number 9* in the *Key Findings*. Also data from registration of community schools need to be improved.
7. All community schoolteachers should be trained in the Primary Reading Programme (PRP) teaching methodologies.

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

There were many *Community Schools* in the colonial era in Central Africa and they were called *Village Schools*. The Village or bush schools were developed, organised and run by different Missionaries, and they became fully accepted schools in the communities where they were established. In Malawi, the term Village School is still in use for schools equivalent to the community schools in Zambia.

The concept of Community Schools in Zambia was started by a woman. In 1992, Dr Janice Stevens, an American in collaboration with the Charity Sisters started a school in an open field in Misisi Compound south of Lusaka. The school was called Misisi Open Community School. Within a short time more such schools were opened in Lusaka. In 1995, these schools came under one registered organisation called Zambia Open Community Schools (ZOCS). This was the first Non-governmental Organisation to run community schools in Zambia. ZOCS is still a very viable NGO and is now running 17 community schools in Lusaka, Kafue and Kabwe.

After 1995 many community schools were opened in the country by different NGOs or individuals. In 1996, the Government of the Republic of Zambia decided to establish an organisation to monitor and co-ordinate the overall activities of the community schools in the country. ZOCS, the flagship of the community schools in Zambia facilitated the formation of Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS), an umbrella body of community schools in Zambia with support from UNICEF, the sole partner to Community Schools Movement in Zambia at that time.

**Table 1: Community schools in Zambia, 1996 – 2004.**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Community Schools</b>
1996	55
1997	123
1998	220
1999	373
2000	416
2003	1,335
2004	1,908

By definition, a community school is an educational institution that is community based, owned and managed by the community. The learning institution meets the basic educational needs of the children who for various reasons cannot enter government schools or are out of the government schools.

As a way of attracting many underprivileged children to enter the community school, the school has unique features that draw children to it. A community school does not charge fees

for teaching children; there is no uniform for the pupils; pupils are not forced to come in shoes; the teachers are volunteers; basic teacher qualification is either Grade 9 or Grade 12 certificate and must be living within the community, and funds for running the school come from the community and other various sources. The voluntary teachers get their upkeep from the support provided by the members of the community either in kind or financially.

The original target groups for community schools were the older children of age range between 9 and 16 years who had never been to school, were out of government school for various reasons, or were vulnerable and orphaned children in the community. These were the children older than the official school enrolment age of 7.

A special curriculum was prepared for the community schools. It was called SPARK. A manual or handbook by the same name was also prepared for use by teachers in community schools. The word SPARK is an acronym for **Skills, Participation, Access to Relevant Knowledge**. The SPARK curriculum was obviously for the older children that were being enrolled in the community schools. The objectives of the SPARK curriculum included the provision of practical pre-vocational skills to the older pupils after graduating from Level 4; provision of life skills; the acquisition of competencies in literacy, numeracy and oracy in local language and in English.

The SPARK curriculum compressed the seven years of government curriculum from Grades 1 to 7, to only four years. As opposed to the government system, the SPARK curriculum does not use *Grades* but *Levels*. Thus, Level one combines Grades 1 and 2; Level 2 combines Grades 3 and 4; Level 3 combines Grades 5 and 6. Level 4 is the equivalent of Grade 7 in a government school and is on its own. Except for Level 4 that takes one year to complete, each Level takes two years of learning to complete. After graduating from Level 4, ideally community school pupils are supposed to enter a Skills Class where they spend one year training in practical skills such as tailoring, woodwork, metalwork, carpentry, agriculture, brick (block)-making, building, cookery and basketry. They are also taught life skills. Such training equips the graduates for vocational life in their communities. Unfortunately, the original design for the Skills Class was not for all SPARK community schools in the country but only for a few of them.

The first SPARK manual following the SPARK curriculum for community schoolteachers was ready in 1997. It was later revised and published in 2000. This manual was further revised and was ready for use in 2002. The many revisions were done in order to meet the dynamic challenges a community schoolteacher needs in the classroom. However, the whole SPARK curriculum is contained in the SPARK manual, the *only* book that a community schoolteacher has for delivery of his/her lessons. It is used in isolation of other learning and teaching materials.

This study aims at evaluating the SPARK curriculum and manual in light of the many developments that have taken place since the first ZCSS syllabus was prepared in 1995, and the first SPARK curriculum was prepared in 1996. The study focuses on the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the SPARK curriculum in SPARK community schools in Zambia from 2000 to 2004.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

### **General Objective**

To assess the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the SPARK curriculum in Community Schools in Zambia from 2000 to 2004.

### **Specific Objectives**

1. To assess the suitability and relevance of the SPARK curriculum and supporting teaching and learning materials for pupils and teachers.
2. To assess the use and effectiveness of SPARK in community schools.
3. To assess the impact of SPARK on attracting and retaining pupils.
4. To assess the impact of SPARK on the quality of teaching and learning in community schools.
5. To summarise positive and negative lessons learned from use of SPARK curriculum.
6. To analyse the current and possible future relation between SPARK and methodologies inherent in the Primary Reading Programme (PRP), especially the Read on Course (ROC).
7. To analyse the current and possible future relation between SPARK and the Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI) Centres (Learning at Taonga Market Educational Radio Programme).
8. To analyse how SPARK and MultiGrade Teaching Methodologies (MTM) can enrich each other.
9. To provide recommendations on the way forward in practical and concise steps on the adjustment, utilisation and implementation of SPARK in community schools.
10. To assess the training in SPARK that has taken place from 2000-2004 and the future need for training in SPARK curriculum.
11. To analyse the user-friendliness of SPARK manual for teachers.
12. To analyse the costs involved in implementing full SPARK curriculum, including SPARK Skills Classes.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Twelve years have passed since community schools were started in Zambia in 1992. In these years many studies have been carried out on various topics relating to community schools in the country. Most of the documents are found at ZCSS and ZOCS offices in Lusaka. There are also a number of documents on community schools kept by UNICEF's library in Lusaka. This chapter looks at documents that are most relevant to the study.

The *ZCSS Activity Report for the Period January to March 2004* [First Quarter of 2004] brings out very interesting statistical data. The document reports that there are 1,908 community schools in the country under ZCSS. Of these, only 951 (50%) are registered with ZCSS. The same report mentions of the ZCSS's future plan of providing bursaries for the untrained community schoolteachers wishing to acquire a government Teachers certificate by studying through the Distance Learning Programme. ZOCS has already started such a programme for its untrained teachers. In 2003, 41 of 149 teachers graduated from the Distance Learning Programme.

The *ZCSS Strategic Plan 2002 – 2006* has very important statistics. The *Strategic Plan* states that only 10% of the community schools follow the SPARK curriculum; 90% of the community schools follow the Zambia Basic Education Course (ZBEC) curriculum and some community schools are following a Combined Curriculum of SPARK and ZBEC. However, on the same issue, the 2001 Ministry of Education document on *Policy and*

*Guidelines for the development of Community Schools in Zambia* stated that 50% of community schools follow the ZBEC curriculum while 40% follow the Combined curriculum of SPARK and ZBEC. It also confirmed that only 10% of the community schools use SPARK curriculum. In the same Ministerial document, there is a clause stating that, "children under 9 should not be accepted in schools offering SPARK" (MOE, *Policy and Guidelines*: 9). The important point to note on these figures is that 10% is too small a figure considering that many years have passed since the SPARK curriculum was born. It should therefore be a source of great concern for the ZCSS. It also means that there is a serious problem with the curriculum on which many untrained teachers in community schools heavily depend. And if 90% of the community schools in the country are following ZBEC curriculum, then it is time that all SPARK curriculum community schools follow the popular ZBEC curriculum.

The Choma *ZCSS Strategic Planning Update Workshop* in 2003 raised four issues in connection with community schools. First, that there is pressure from parents in the communities for the community schools to begin attracting children below 7 years for Community Nursery classes. However, as at present, the community school policy does not allow the introduction of Early Childhood, Care Development and Education (ECCDE) in the schools. Second, that only 5% [no absolute figure given in the documents] of community schoolteachers have undergone the two-year Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) Teacher Training programme. This number is too small compared to the need for community schoolteachers in the country where there are slightly over 1,900 community schools. Third, that grants from the Ministry of Education began being disbursed from 2001. In that year only 485 (50.9%) schools benefited. In 2002 the number rose to 720 (75.7%) out of the 951 officially registered ZCSS community schools in the country. Even this number is too small compared to the need for government financial assistance to community schools in the whole country. In fact, the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Ministry of Education

and ZCSS of 2001 promised grants to all registered community schools. Fourth, by September 2003, the following was the picture of community schools in the study areas we visited:

**Table 2: The status of community schools in the Study Areas**

Province	Not Registered	Registered	Total
Copperbelt	192	253	445
Lusaka	130	81	211
Southern	127	165	292
Sub-total:	449	499	948
<b>National Total</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>1,908</b>

Of the total 951 registered community schools *in the whole country*, Copperbelt province had 253 (26.6%); Lusaka province had 81 (8.5%) and Southern province had 165 (17.3%). Together, *the three study area provinces* had a total of 499 (52.5%) registered community schools and 449 (46.9%) unregistered community schools bringing the total number of community schools in the study area to 948. This means that for the registered community schools, the rest of the country (six provinces) shares the remaining 452 (47.5%) registered community schools. Thus, of the total 1908 community schools in the country, 951 (49.8%) are registered and 957 (50.2%) are not.

The last relevant document to look at was the 2003 ZCSS: *Sample Survey of Community School Education in Zambia*. Three important issues are raised in this document. First, that the community's pressure on community schools to initiate the ECCDE classes is bearing fruits in some community schools. Ndeke Community School in Mazabuka yielded to the pressure and is now running an ECCDE Community Nursery class. ZOCS yielded to the pressure much earlier as reported in its 2003 Annual Report. Second, the survey raised concern on the Ministry of Education (MOE) practice of taking over community-built Community Schools. This practice defeats the whole policy of community participation in education at local level. Third, that all MOE Resource Centres in the country are open to community school teachers for various training activities as contained in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed between the MOE and ZCSS in 2001.

In 2003, 540 community schoolteachers completed their teacher training programmes in various government Teacher Training Colleges in the country while 1600 were still on training in the government Teacher Training Colleges. At the end of February 2004, 274 community schoolteachers were trained in the methodologies to effectively handle Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI), Learning at Taonga Market educational Radio programme. Additionally, at the end of the First Quarter (March) of 2004, 130 community schoolteachers were trained in various parts of the country using these facilities. The trainings took place mainly in the Ministry of Education Resource Centres around the country. Many more community schoolteachers are earmarked for training in 2004.

ZCSS has also planned to train Provincial Education Standards Officers (PESO), District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS) and Education Standards Officers (ESO) in how to monitor community schools using the SPARK teaching methodologies. In December 2004,

4000 community schoolteachers nation-wide will be trained in Primary Reading Programme (PRP) to handle Read on Course (ROC) methodologies. The training programme is sponsored by UNICEF and co-operating partners.

### **CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study utilised both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. For qualitative methodologies, views were obtained from the participants, namely, teachers, current and former pupils; parents in the Parent Community School Committees (PCSCs); representatives of local and international Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) and co-operating partners. Quantitative research methodology was employed specifically to obtain statistical data.

Vast amount of primary data were collected by interviewing participants either in Focus Group Discussions or individually. Teachers were interviewed together, male and female where they were more than one. Pupils were also interviewed in groups and of mixed gender. Parents in the PCSC were also interviewed together in a mixed gender group. Interviews with co-operating partners in Lusaka who directly or indirectly support SPARK community schools were very enriching indeed.

Substantial primary data were also collected using questionnaires developed by the consultants and checked by UNICEF, the sponsors and the Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS), representing the Ministry of Education (MOE). A questionnaire was formulated for each category of participants. For details on categories of the Study Instruments and various target groups see Appendix C. Considerable secondary data were also collected from documents obtained from ZCSS office, ZOCS office, and UNICEF library.

The Terms of Reference focused on two provinces for the study: The Copperbelt Province, where the study was undertaken mainly in Masaiti District. The other province was Southern Province focusing on Livingstone and Mazabuka districts. In order to understand the Primary Reading Programme (PRP) and the MultiGrade Teaching Methodologies (MTM) in community schools, the fieldwork was extended to Luangwa, Chongwe and Kafue districts in Lusaka Province.

In each study area, we made sure that a visit was made to a SPARK community school in an urban area; a SPARK community school in a rural area; a non-SPARK community school; an IRI Centre (School) using SPARK curriculum and a SPARK community school where teachers were using the MultiGrade / PRP methodologies.

## CHAPTER FOUR: TEACHERS, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Detailed interviews with teachers in the community schools established that many of them hold Grade 12 certificates and are untrained. They expressed urgent need for them to be trained in a government Teacher Training College. They also stated that it was necessary for community schoolteachers to be inducted on how to use the SPARK manual before her/his first lesson in any class. This is because the manual is the only official teaching material a teacher has in a community school and it is the basis of the SPARK curriculum.

Unfortunately, as of now, there is no College in Zambia where community schoolteachers go to train using the SPARK curriculum or in the use of the SPARK manual. However, some community schoolteachers have attended a few workshops organised by either ZOCS or ZCSS on how to use the SPARK manual. Such workshops have not trained all ZCSS community schoolteachers in the country. Teachers lamented that such workshops have in the past been infrequent and not well co-ordinated. A few ZCSS community schools find it difficult to acquire the SPARK manuals for their teachers. This is the reason such schools do not use the SPARK curriculum and manual.

**Table 3: Use of the SPARK manual in community schools in the Study Areas**

Community school	Study Area	SPARK community school	Non-SPARK community school	IRI	IRI and SPARK	ZBEC	SPARK and ZBEC
Ndeke	<u>Mazabuka</u>			X			X
Changachanga			X	X		X	
Shimungalu			X	X		X	
Linda	<u>L/Stone</u>	X					
Libuyu		X					
Maanu Mbwami					X		
Mapenzi		X					
Ngwenya			X			X	
Kabambula	<u>Masai</u>		X		X	X	
Mulilantambo			X			X	
Chisankano			X		X	X	
Michinka				X			

*Key: X indicates a SPARK or Non-SPARK community school, or use of either IRI, SPARK or ZBEC.*

At present the SPARK manual is the only book that a community schoolteacher uses in the delivery of SPARK lessons. It is both the curriculum and the manual used only by teachers. All the teachers talked to agreed that there was urgent necessity for a SPARK pupils' book based on the current SPARK curriculum and manual. Teachers stated that the SPARK pupils' book would certainly reduce on the amount of time spent by the teacher writing on the board as the case is currently. This practice has contributed to the continued prevalence of the teacher centred lessons in SPARK community schools. With the availability of the pupils' book, pupils will have their own exercises in their book matching the work or topics in the teachers' SPARK manual.

Originally, the SPARK manual was not meant to be the only source for teachers in the SPARK curriculum community schools. Additional sources were to include textbooks, Zedukit and the Teacher's Guide. However, these supplementary sources have not reached all SPARK curriculum community schools. During interviews teachers lamented that the SPARK manual was the only source they had. They also explained that on its own, the SPARK manual was not sufficient to cater for all the children's learning needs in 4 years. In fact, the teachers concluded that, together with pupils in the community schools, they needed more learning and teaching materials than those in government schools because their curriculum is compressed to only four years instead of the normal seven years. The majority of teachers in these schools are also of humble education and are untrained. Thus, learners need a Pupils' Book and other supplementary materials while teachers need reference books for different subjects or subject areas within the SPARK curriculum. Reference books and other supplementary materials for teachers will enhance the quality of teaching. Teachers will use them when preparing lesson plans and will also enrich their understanding of the various subject areas. Reference materials will also help them in preparing remedial work for slow learners.

Many community school pupils write the Grade 7 government examinations to enter Grade 8. Results of the Grade 7 examinations for the community school pupils show that a small number passes and enters Grade 8 as shown in Table 5 in Chapter 5. This is a clear indication that community school education is credible and relevant to the needs of pupils and society. The small number of the pupils who pass to Grades 8 and 10, and Colleges can also be an indication that there is something wrong with either the way the syllabus is taught or the way the curriculum is designed or a combination of both.

SPARK curriculum and manual were originally meant for children of the age range 9 to 16 years. Things have changed. There are many children in the community schools that are of the age range 7 to 14 years. Teachers interviewed stated that the SPARK manual and curriculum are suitable for the older children, 9 to 16 years. Technically, and pedagogically the SPARK manual is unsuitable for the learning needs of the younger children of 7 to 14 years.

**Table 4: Age Ranges at Enrolment (Level 1) for Community School Pupils in the Study Area**

**(a) Linda Spark community school, Livingstone**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	7 – 16
2	10 – 20
3	13 – 20
4	16 – 20

**(b) Mapenzi Spark community school, Livingstone**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	7 – 8
2	10 – 13
3	13 – 19
4	N/A

**(c) Libuyu Spark community school, Livingstone**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	7 – 10
2	10 – 14
3	14 – 16
4	15 – 17

**(d) Michinka community school, Masaiti**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	8 – 9
2	9 – 12
3	12 – 15
4	15 – 20

**(e) Kabambula community school, Masaiti**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	7 – 10
2	10 – 15
3	15 – 20
4	N/A

**(f) Ndeke community school, Mazabuka**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	8 – 10
2	11 – 13
3	14 – 15
4	16 - 17

**(g) Changachanga community school, Mazabuka**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	9 – 10
2	10 – 11
3	11 – 13
4	12 – 14

**(h) Shimungalu community school, Mazabuka**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Age Range*</b>
1	7 – 8
2	8 – 10
3	11 – 15
4	14 – 16

*\*Age Ranges at enrolment (Level 1)*

As a result of the Levels system applied in community schools where children of different age groups are in one class, teachers find it difficult to use the SPARK manual to both groups at the same time in the same Level. The children are not only of different age ranges but their mental development is also different. In this situation, teachers that are trained stated that they use the multi-Grade teaching methodologies to go round the problem. In general, the results at Grade 7 examination show that the older children perform better than the younger children. This is attributed to their higher mental development than the younger pupils.

In the Focus Group Discussions with community schoolteachers, it became very clear that they would like the SPARK manual revised (or completely overhauled) and simplified according to the different mental ages of the pupils in Levels 1 to 4. This would make the book cater more effectively for the learning needs of the different age groups. As of now, being the only book for teachers especially from the untrained teacher point of view, the SPARK manual makes teachers' lessons and teaching slightly easier than would be the case if it were not there. However, this view does not legitimise the continued existence of the SPARK manual in community schools given the many problems associated with it as explained in proceeding chapters. For example, its unsuitability for the learning needs of younger children who constitute the majority in community schools currently.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: PUPILS, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

In the SPARK community schools in Livingstone, Mazabuka and Masaiti districts where we interviewed the learners in Level 4 (equivalent to Grade 7 in government schools), it was clear that pupils appreciate the skills and competencies they have acquired from the SPARK curriculum. Pupils stated that the education they have had since Level one in the SPARK community schools has enabled them to be competent in:

- Writing letters to friends and writing letters for their parents.
- Speaking some English that would enable them enhance their chances of finding employment.
- Numeracy: calculations that enable them provide accurate change in their family businesses.
- Reading simple books and at times the Newspapers.
- Drawing maps and diagrams and this has made some of them develop interest in artwork.

They also confirmed that because of the quality education from their schools, their friends from the community are joining them. Many pupils are remaining in school up to Level 4. Thereafter, they write Grade 7 examinations to enter Grade 8 in government Basic Schools. A small number of former pupils from community schools have passed the Grade 7 examinations and are now learning in Grades 8 to 12. For example, out of a population of 240 pupils in the community schools in the whole study area (40 pupils in Level 4 in each of the 6 community schools in **Table 5**), only 42 out of 240 girls passed to Grade 8 in 2003 and 74 out of 240 boys qualified to Grade 8 in the same year. The total number of community school

pupils who entered Grade 8 in 2003 was a meager 116 (48.3%). Others, though few, are even in Colleges pursuing higher education. Both current Level 4 pupils in the SPARK community schools we visited and former pupils of these schools agree that academically the SPARK curriculum on its own as it is today does not adequately prepare pupils for Grades 8 and 9. Their reasons for this are many. They lamented that in its focus, the SPARK curriculum only goes up to Grade 7 level of education. It does not go beyond Grade 7 in its grounding of the learners who may wish to go to Grades 8 and 9. In spite of this shortcoming in the SPARK curriculum the learners write Grade 7 examinations to enter Grade 8. The SPARK curriculum does not fully cover the government Basic School curriculum that adequately prepares pupils in government schools for Grades 8 and 9 education.

**Table 5: 2002 – 2003 Pupils from selected community schools that qualified to Grades 8, 10 and Colleges**

COMMUNITY SCHOOL	TO GRADE 8 **		TO GRADE 10 *		TO COLLEGE*		SP	NP
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls		
<b>Libuyu (Livingstone)</b>	4	3	-	1	-	-	X	-
<b>Linda (Livingstone)</b>	7	4	5	2	-	1	X	-
<b>Michinka (Masaiti)</b>	8	5	-	-	-	-	-	X
<b>Kabambula (Masaiti)</b>	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	X
<b>Changachanga (Mazabuka)</b>	34	20	-	-	-	-	-	X
<b>Ndeke(Mazabuka)</b>	19	7	11	4	-	-	X	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

*\*Data for former community school pupils in Grades 10-12 and Colleges were not available.*

*\*\*The average Level 4 (Grade 7) class size was*

*SP, SPARK curriculum community school, NP, Non-SPARK curriculum community school*

Pupils agreed that due to the inadequacies outlined in the foregoing paragraphs, the SPARK curriculum in use in community schools should be reviewed to adequately prepare those pupils who may wish to enter Upper Basic School (Grades 8 and 9). In reviewing the SPARK curriculum, focus should be placed on extending the depth of coverage so that the material covered adequately prepares pupils to cope with Grades 8 and 9 work in Upper Basic School. Another dimension of the review of the SPARK curriculum is for it include or incorporate Grades 8 and 9 materials that are taught in the Upper Basic Schools. This dimension is in line with current government policy, which stipulates that Basic Education

runs from Grades 1 to 9. If community schools are to offer Basic Education, they should therefore, logically incorporate Grades 8 to 9 material as government schools do.

## **CHAPTER SIX: SKILLS CLASS, SKILLS TRAINING AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

When the concept of *Community School* was being conceived in 1994 a major component of the curriculum aimed at making the illiterate child who has never been to school or semi-literate who was out-of-school for various reasons literate. Thereafter, the intention was to make the literate child acquire certain practical skills for survival in the community where she/he came from. Initially and theoretically the two components were incorporated when the highly celebrated SPARK curriculum and manual were put in place for the community schools in the country. Many community schools were to have on their premises a Skills Class for pupils graduating from Level 4 (Grade 7).

After completing Level 4 pupils were supposed to proceed to the Skills Class. Note that not all SPARK curriculum community schools had Skills Classes. These were only in *some* SPARK curriculum community schools where the Level 4 graduates were to be trained in practical skills such as tailoring, woodwork, metal work, carpentry, basketry, block (brick)-making, agriculture and cooking. In the SPARK or non-SPARK community schools visited there were no skills classes for Level 4 graduates. However, although we did not visit the school as it was outside the targeted study areas, Kabwe Open Community School, one of the 17 community schools under ZOCS was opened in 1995 and later started the first Skills Class in the ZOCS schools. Also, Ndeke Community School in Mazabuka under ZCSS is the only community school among the ZCSS schools where practical skills subjects are taught as normal subjects on the School Time Table.

Following the original policy of providing skills after Level 4, in selected SPARK community schools, in *some* community school Ndeke Community School began implementing this noble policy. But the school found it difficult to retain graduates of Level 4 for skills training in the Skills Class on the school premises because most of the pupils did not want to attend the Skills Class after completing Level 4. Instead, the Level 4 graduates whose age range averaged 14 and below wanted to continue with academic education. As a result of their intense desire to continue schooling, they left Ndeke Community School in search of Grade 8 places in the government Basic schools in Mazabuka and elsewhere in the province. This became a serious set back for the school and the concept of a Skills Class after Level 4 had to be revisited following pupil objections.

After discussions with the District Education Board Secretary officials, a solution was found for the problem. The subjects to be learnt in the Skills Class after Level 4 were incorporated as academic subjects to be learnt by pupils in Grades 8 and 9. When this system was introduced, pupils who graduated in Level 4 continued to Grade 8 at the same school, Ndeke Community School. The skills training was now offered to pupils after Grade 9 level of education. Those who passed to go to Grade 10 went ahead and continued with their studies. Those who did not make it to Grade 10, went to St. Paul's Skills Training College within Mazabuka,. With the good academic background from Ndeke Community School where

pupils studied practical subjects, their performance at the College has been satisfactory. The college runs a two-year training programme and the graduates are seasonally or permanently absorbed by Nakambala Sugar Company in Mazabuka. Other graduates find employment in various institutions within and outside Mazabuka district.

In Livingstone, the research team discovered a former SPARK community school Level 4 graduate. She was trained at David Livingstone Teacher Training College (DLTTC) in various skills in the 1996 – 1997 academic year. Her skills included basketry and tailoring. However, due to lack of funds, she and her friends never practised what they learnt. Up to now they are still looking for funds to start some business based on what they learnt at the college.

## **CHAPTER SEVEN: MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

At provincial level, senior Ministry of Education officials agreed that community schools offer useful skills and competencies to the learners. They also confirmed that such skills benefit parents and communities in many ways. Children who had lost hope of ever going to school or going back to school to learn are now in school. Many of them have completed Level 4 in community schools. They are now able to perform sophisticated numerical skills, read books, write and read letters for their parents and, others have gone to Basic and High Schools and Colleges.

It was clear from our discussions with the senior officials in the Ministry of Education in the study areas that more needs to be done by the Ministry of Education to improve the overall status and quality of education in the community schools in the country. It was noted that since not all pupils go to the Skill Class after Level 4, the SPARK curriculum should be revisited to adequately prepare those pupils who want to enter Grade 8. As of now, the SPARK curriculum only prepares pupils up to Grade 7. Those who want to go beyond Grade 7 have problems not only in understanding the curriculum for Grades 8 and 9 in the Upper Basic School but also in the preparations before writing the Grade 7 examinations at Level 4.

The senior education officials also noted that the SPARK curriculum does not provide reference materials for both teachers and pupils. This situation makes teachers *wholly* dependent on one source for all their teaching material requirements. They are not able to expand outside the SPARK manuals.

According to Ministry of Education officials, the communities would benefit more from community schools if there were Skills Classes after Level 4 for the older pupils who want to undergo skills training and are not interested in pursuing education beyond that level. As stated elsewhere in this study, there are no community schools in the whole study area that run Skills Classes. This is because of two main reasons. First, there are no facilities for such a Class. That is to say, there is no equipment for a Skills class. Second, even if the equipments were available, the teachers in community schools are not trained to handle a Skills class. It will require either recruiting new teachers, trained in Industrial Arts or training the current Grade 12 community school teachers in Industrial Arts, hoping that after their training they will come back to teach in community schools on voluntary basis.

The Ministry of Education officials explained that a number of teachers trained in government Teacher Training Colleges find their way into the community schools. Similarly, after training in government Teacher Training Colleges, some community schoolteachers return to their former schools. The teachers find it difficult to adjust to the teaching methodologies in the community schools. This is because the Teacher Training Colleges where they trained did not orient them in the use of SPARK curriculum and manual or in the methodologies that go with the curriculum and the manual. The current study has also established that the various government Teacher Training Colleges neither have community

schools concepts nor teaching strategies in their college curriculum or syllabuses. All trainees including teachers from community schools are subjected to ZATEC curriculum that does not include aspects of the SPARK curriculum. It will be helpful if in future Teacher Training Colleges incorporated community school concepts and teaching strategies in their curricular. Once the curriculum has changed, it will be possible for Colleges to post trainee teachers to community school during teaching practice sessions. Those doing Industrial Arts, can be posted to community schools teaching practical skills subjects like Ndeke Community School in Mazabuka. For this reason, they suggested that government Teacher Training Colleges should include SPARK curriculum (and manual) in their overall Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) curriculum.

The Ministry of Education officials further suggested that their Standards officers at Provincial and District levels should undergo refresher courses in assessing community school teachers. Once they are equipped with knowledge on assessment of community schools, each District should have a Standard officer *specifically* for community schools. They also felt that there should be a Provincial Standards Officer for community schools *only*. Such a move, the officials said, would enhance learning in community schools and improve the status of these schools in the country.

## **CHAPTER EIGHT: PARENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL COMMITTEE AND COMMUNITY SCHOOL**

As explained in the introduction of this study, a community school is formed by the members of a community. The sole aim of a community school is to provide education to the out-of-school children or children who have never been to school for various socio-economic reasons. A community school is run by a Parent Community School Committee (PCSC), an equivalent of Parent Teachers Association (PTA) in government schools. The PCSC is responsible for the daily running of the school and the selection of children. The committee consists of Community leaders, parents and teachers.

The Parent Community School Committee is the main link between the community and the community school. In the Focus Group Interviews with some Parent Community School Committees in the study areas, it was clear from the discussion that parents see community schools as their last hope for their children's education. They see community schools as educational institutions that provide their children with skills and competencies that eventually assist them in various ways in the communities. For example, parents at Linda Community School in Livingstone proudly revealed that some Level 4 graduates from the

Community School have found employment as gardeners, while others have been employed by Lodges in Livingstone. They are bringing income in the community where they came from.

Parents appreciate the use of SPARK curriculum in the Community schools because it offers life skills and competencies that quickly make their children learn how to read, write

and understand calculations. They also speak English by the end of Level 1. They noted that this achievement is not easy to attain in government schools at the same level.

It was discovered from the interviews that literate (educated) parents know that SPARK curriculum is not adequately preparing their younger children to enter Grade 8. Their children have no supplementary learning materials and their performance in the Grade 7 examinations is below satisfactory level. For this reason, the literate parents want the SPARK curriculum extensively revised with Grades 8 and 9 materials incorporated so as to be on the same level with government Upper Basic schools. In fact, parents want community schools to go up to Grade 9 as is the case in government schools.

However, parents who are illiterate or semi-literate did not see the inadequacy of the SPARK curriculum for their children wishing to proceed to Grades 8 and 9. For them, the various competencies that their children acquired from community schools and are already using or demonstrating were all they needed and appreciated. They were unable to understand issues of curriculum beyond community school level.

## **CHAPTER NINE: INTERACTIVE RADIO INSTRUCTION, SPARK CURRICULUM AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI) was started in 2001 by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in order to increase access to education in the country. It was particularly meant for the out-of-school children or children who have never been to school. During the fieldwork in Livingstone, Mazabuka and Masaiti districts it was discovered that some IRI centres were non-functional because the mentors (teachers) had left the centres for greener pasture elsewhere. However, there were a few working IRI centres that we visited. There was Michinka IRI centre in Masaiti, Njomona Salvation Army IRI centre and Njomona Catholic IRI centre in Mazabuka, and Maanu Mbwami Community School and IRI centre in Livingstone. Maanu Mbwami Community School is also an IRI centre and using the SPARK curriculum. The other IRI centres that are not community schools are of course using the government Zambia Basic Education Course (ZBEC) curriculum.

The Maanu Mbwami IRI-SPARK Community School in Libuyu in Livingstone has five teachers of whom only one, female, is a government-trained teacher who recently came from the College to rejoin the community school. Prior to going to the College, the teacher was a trained IRI teacher. She was trained by the Education Broadcasting Services (EBS) in the teaching methodologies using the IRI approach. The other teachers, two females and two males have not been trained in either IRI or the government ZBEC curriculum.

The pupils talked to at Maanu Mbwami revealed that they had acquired many skills from both IRI methodologies and SPARK curriculum that their teachers are teaching them. The skills or competencies they learnt included:

- Reading
- Writing
- Speaking simple English
- Numeracy: calculations of various types
- Life skills taught on Radio

Teachers in the IRI centres or community schools using IRI methodologies use the Mentor's Guide for IRI Taonga Market Radio programmes. They also use the SPARK manual for the other lessons as well as a few books mainly Readers from the Ministry of Education. The Radio at the IRI centre is an important piece of equipment for teaching during the IRI educational broadcasts. The Radio lessons are enhanced by the use of the local languages by the Class Teacher, the Mentor.

Teachers and pupils at Community schools where both IRI educational radio broadcasts and the SPARK manual are used, revealed that bringing the two '*institutions*' [IRI and SPARK community school] together has improved the quality of teaching and education in the respective community schools. For example, they confirmed that where the two have come together, pupils learn faster than those in community schools where pupils do not listen to the IRI Taonga Market educational broadcasts lessons.

According to EBS officials, the relationship between IRI and community schools is much stronger in Lusaka and Mumbwa districts than anywhere else in the country. The bond is so strong that EBS has trained many community schoolteachers in the IRI methods of presenting lessons. Additionally, in 2003, EBS trained 80 ZOCS teachers in the use of local languages in the IRI broadcasts. Radios for IRI use have been given to all 17 ZOCS schools. Furthermore, some ZCSS Parent Community Schools Committees have sent their teachers for training in IRI methodologies at EBS. The officials revealed that unfortunately, many SPARK community schools that use IRI have abandoned the SPARK curriculum, especially those in Lusaka and Mumbwa districts. They are now using ZBEC, the same curriculum that the IRI centres are using.

In Lusaka, however, an interesting relationship has developed between IRI centres and community schools. Many IRI centres have applied for a Certificate of Recognition as a community school from Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS). The certificate enables the affected IRI centres to be registered as community schools. Once registration is completed, the IRI centres become in practice community schools and therefore qualify for a grant from the Ministry of Education, part of which is used to pay teachers (Mentors). The certificate also enables the IRI centres qualify for the Feeding Programme, which caters only for community schools.

**Table 6: PUPIL PROFILE: MAANU MBWAMI SPARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL WITH IRI, LIVINGSTONE**

GRADE	AGE GROUP	FEMALE	MALE	SEN PUPILS		
				MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
1	6-12	12	18		-	30
2	8-13	20	17		-	37
3	10-14	12	13		-	25
4	13-15	8	17		-	25
5	14-16	5	10		-	15
6	15-17	6	8		1	15
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>63</b>	<b>83</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>147</b>

**Table 7: TEACHER PROFILE: MAANU MBWAMI SPARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL WITH IRI, LIVINGSTONE**

GRADE 12	FEMALE	MALE
Trained with Teacher's certificate	1	0
Untrained	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

**Table 8: PUPIL PROFILE: MICHINKA IRI CENTRE, MASAITI**

GRADE	AGE GROUP	FEMALE	MALE	SEN PUPILS		
				MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
1	1 – 8	43	44	-	-	87
2	9 – 12	40	43	-	2	85
3	12 – 15	28	30	-	-	58
4	15 – 20	15	16	-	-	31
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>126</b>	<b>133</b>	-	<b>2</b>	<b>261</b>

**Table 9: TEACHER PROFILE: MICHINKA IRI CENTRE, MASAITI**

<b>GRADE 12</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>MALE</b>
Trained with Teacher's certificate	0	0
Untrained	1	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>

## **CHAPTER TEN: SPARK CURRICULUM, PRIMARY READING PROGRAMME, MULTIGRADE AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

The Primary Reading Programme (PRP) is a new literacy programme in government schools throughout the country from Grades 1 to Grade 7. It focuses on making the learner learn how to read beginning with literacy in the child's local language. After mastering literacy in the local language the learner goes a step further by learning to be literate in English. It aims at making children learn to *read* within the first one year (Grade 1) of their formal education. Thereafter, reading becomes a tool of learning more things in school.

The Primary Reading Programme comprises in three parts. The first part is called New Breakthrough to Literacy (NBTL) meant for Grade 1 pupils. At this level, literacy is in the local language. After learning to read, the child builds on this knowledge to Step into English (SITE) in Grade 2. This time, instead of the local language, the child learns English. From Grade 3 to 7, the child follows a reading programme called ROC, Read on Course.

Studies have shown that the PRP in Zambia has had a very high success rate since its inception in 1999. It makes the learners literate in both the local language and English within the first two years of school life. According to Mr. G. Tambulukani, a University of Zambia scholar behind this programme, there are 76 community schools on PRP in the country. In 2003, 35% of pupils in the community schools on PRP reached the National Reading Benchmark of 64% for literacy and numeracy. Mr. Tambulukani concluded that a trained teacher in a community school can effortlessly and effectively use the ROC component of PRP and easily achieve the desired results in literacy. However, the new simplified version of ROC, known as Read on Express (ROE) just released on the market will make it easy for community schoolteachers to follow. The ROE has addressed the issues at Levels 1 – 4.

Unfortunately, during fieldwork the research team was unable to reach or find a community school let alone a SPARK community school on PRP in the study areas. The District Education Board Secretaries told us that PRP had not yet reached community schools in their respective districts. One reason for this is that community school teachers have not yet been trained in how to teach using the PRP methodologies. However, a few community schools like Ndeke in Mazabuka and others in Kafue district are teaching using the PRP methodologies. The information on a few community schools in Kafue district using PRP methodologies was only confirmed by the Education Standards Officer in Kafue. We were unable to reach such community schools due to distance, time factor and logistical problems.

According to Brother Bernard Hayes, a Christian Brother running St. Edmunds Co-learning Services in Mazabuka, the PRP is “one of the best programmes ever introduced in primary schools in Zambia.... It makes children learn how to read within a short period, first in their local languages, then in the English language.” He observed that, “within the next few years many children in schools [community school or not] will be able to read and write by the time they reach Grade 7. In the past this was not the case. Many children in Grade 4 did not know how to read or write”. Quoting from Gabriel Carson of IIEP, UNESCO [nd], Brother Hays emphasised that, “keeping children in school for six years without mastering how to read is an investment in ignorance, not an investment in education.” He concluded that, “with PRP, Zambia will be investing in education not ignorance”.

Multi-grade teaching is a methodology specifically for teaching pupils of more than one Grade (Level) mixed in one classroom. Such a situation arises where there are few teachers for many pupils or where there are few pupils in each Grade (Level) and there are also few teachers in the school.

Surprisingly, the research team was told by Ministry of Education officials in the study areas that officially or as a policy, multi-grade teaching is not encouraged in government schools although it is still being used in some schools where extreme circumstances compel teachers to use the methodology. Nankanga government school, forty-five kilometers southeast of Lusaka in the hills is such a school. There are only two teachers for Grades 1 to 7. In Luangwa district, Chilombwe and Kaluluzi community schools on the banks of the Zambezi and Luangwa Rivers respectively are the only two community schools we visited that practice the multi-grade teaching methodologies. The government trained teachers we found at Chilombwe community school are all trained in multi-grade teaching methodologies while the untrained teacher at Kaluluzi community school has been exposed to this methodology through Teacher Group Meetings at workshops within the district. He also gets additional assistance in this methodology from government teachers in the neighbourhood.

## **CHAPTER ELEVEN: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMME**

The teachers we interviewed in the community schools came from their respective communities. All had Grade 12 academic qualifications. Many of them are untrained teachers and they want to be trained. Teachers want training to be at three levels, namely, at induction into SPARK curriculum and SPARK manual level; at College level and at Workshop level. Once or twice a year a workshop should be organised for community schoolteachers in each province on SPARK curriculum and the use of the SPARK manual. They explained that, that was crucial as many community schoolteachers needed to be oriented on how to use the SPARK manual, especially those with Grade 9 academic qualifications.

**Table 10: Trained and Untrained community school teachers in Study Areas**

<b>Community schools in the Study Areas (District)</b>	<b>College-trained Teachers</b>	<b>Untrained Teachers</b>	<b>Total</b>
Livingstone	3	9	12
Mazabuka	6	11	17
Masaiti	0	3	3
Masaiti/Mpongwe	0	1	1

Ministry of Education has an agreement with ZCSS to train community schoolteachers countrywide. Community schoolteachers have special entry criteria to government Teacher Training Colleges, namely, (a) being a community schoolteacher (b) 3 credits including English and 2 passes. There are many untrained teachers in community schools who have the entry qualifications to government Teacher Training Colleges. What they do not have is the money to pay as fees for the two-year duration of the training programme. They need sponsorship to go and train in government colleges. In the community schools we visited, untrained teachers constituted the largest number of teachers teaching in the schools. Others are even administrators of the schools.

Both trained and untrained teachers talked to would like the Zambia Community School Secretariat (ZCSS) to be organising short workshops for them on teaching methodologies and preparation of teaching aids. Such workshops would enhance their knowledge on the art of teaching in community schools.

From the field interviews with teachers, it seems in the past there had been some problems in training teachers in the ZCSS schools. However, this is no longer the case. ZCSS together with ZOCS have established concrete training links for their teachers with government Teacher Training Colleges, namely, Charles Lwanga in Monze, Malcom Moffat in Mkushi, Islamic College in Lusaka and David Livingstone Teacher Training College.

In ZOCS, the untrained teachers who are under qualified to enter government Teacher Training College are assisted by the institution to obtain necessary qualifications to enter the College. They assist them with funds to pursue Grade 12 studies privately. ZOCS also hold workshops for teachers where, besides the core area of teaching methodology, teachers are additionally given thorough training in HIV-AIDS, Life skills and Peer counselling for pupils. By April 2004, 169 teachers had been trained by ZOCS. As a result of the good training programme ZOCS has instituted, some of its own community schools graduates have been trained as teachers and are serving some of its community schools. St. Patrick and Bauleni Community schools in Lusaka have former pupils as teachers.

The Principal of David Livingstone Teacher Training College assured us that in the next academic year beginning September 2004, he would enrol about 50 trainee teachers from community schools. They will be sponsored by the Save the Children, Norway, an international NGO based in Livingstone. However, the training of these community schoolteachers should include methodologies in community school teaching. This will be

effective if the Lecturers are themselves trained in the community school teaching methodologies. As of now such skills have not been acquired by the Lecturers in the College.

## **CHAPTER TWELVE: COST OF IMPLEMENTING FULL SPARK CURRICULUM IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

This study found it difficult to determine the exact cost of running a ZCSS SPARK community school per annum. The Directors, Headteachers or Supervisors could not estimate how much it cost them to run their community schools per month or per year. As funds come erratically they never thought of keeping a systematic accounts of what it takes to run their schools. However, after long discussions with the members of the PCSCs, Directors, Head Teachers and Supervisors, an item by item cost was estimated, either per month or per year. Tables 6 and 7 are as a result of the detailed discussions. However, the figures must be taken with a grain of salt. They are only as good as they show a general picture of the areas where money is commonly expended other than the *actual definite* costs per annum.

The costs were divided into two categories, namely, a Rural SPARK community school and an Urban SPARK community schools. For some items, the cost is mainly in labour that the members of the community put in, in carrying out a specific listed task. All the figures are average figures from three SPARK community schools. Note that the average costs shown here are for Livingstone community schools only. The costs may represent many schools in similar situations of poverty.

In Livingstone, Linda SPARK community school is also a Drop in Centre for street children who eventually become pupils at the school. They sleep and feed there. In Mazabuka, Ndeke SPARK community school provides a plate of porridge to each pupil just before the learner reports for his/her first lesson each school day. Their costs will be much higher than the community schools without these additional but necessary costs.

**Table 11: RURAL SPARK CURRICULUM COMMUNITY SCHOOL (EXISTING TEMPORARY STRUCTURES)**

	ITEM	ESTIMATED COSTS		
		PER MONTH	PER YEAR	TOTAL
1.	Allowances for 2 teachers	K500,000	K 6 Million	K6 Million
2.	Teaching aids	-	K300,000	K300,000
3.	Learning materials	-	K1 Million	K1 Million
4.	Grass for thatching classrooms	-	K200,000	K200,000
5.	Plastering class rooms	-	K50,000	K50,000
6.	Repairs to Class rooms	-	K50,000	K50,000

7.	Benches for pupils	-	K2 Million	K2 Million
8.	Sacks of empty mealie meal bags for sitting on	-	K30,000	K30,000
9.	Special school cleaning	-	K150,000	K150,000
10.	Weeding of school crops	-	K100,000	K100,000
11.	Recruiting of children and teachers	-	K200,000	K200,000
12.	Toiletries (tissue paper)	K50,000	K600,000	K600,000
13.	Pens, Pencils, rulers and ex. Books	-	K1 Million	K1 Million
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>K11,680,000</b>	

#### NOTES

1. The cost of these items will increase but later less will also be bought if the previous ones are stored properly or not damaged
2. The source is true for the learning materials
3. Once benches are bought, it takes time to buy new ones. What is important is to repair the broken ones. Only materials to repair broken ones will be bought.
4. These are only for schools where there are no benches once these are bought, there will be no need for sacks.
5. These are fast consumables and their prices will increase over time. Therefore, the cost will also increase.

**Table 12: IMPLEMENTING AN URBAN SPARK CURRICULUM COMMUNITY SCHOOL (EXISTING PERMANENT STRUCTURES)**

	ITEM	ESTIMATED COSTS		
		PER MONTH	PER YEAR	TOTAL
1.	Allowances for 6 teachers	K1,500,000	K18 Million	K18 Million
2.	Teaching aids	-	K500,000	K500,000
3.	Learning materials	-	K1,500,000	K1,500,000
4.	Repairs to class rooms	-	K100,000	K100,000
5.	Special cleaning at school	-	K150,000	K150,000
6.	Recruitment of teachers	-	K200,000	K200,000

	and children			
7.	Toiletries (tissues paper)	K100,000	K1,200,000	K1,200,000
8.	Pens, pencils, chalk, rulers and ex. Books	-	K1,500,000	K1,500,000
9.	Water	K250,000	K3Million	K3 Million
10.	Electricity	K100,000	K1,200,000	K1,200,000
11.	Photocopying	-	K500,000	K500,000
12.	Benches for pupils	-	K3 Million	K3 Million
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>K30,850,000</b>	

NOTES:

The cost of these items will eventually increase but later on, it will cost less if the previous ones are stored properly or not damaged.

1. The same is true for the learning materials
2. These are fast consumables and their prices will increase over time. Therefore, the overall cost will also increase.
3. For community schools where they cook for children, the cost of this item will eventually increase
4. The same is true for the electricity
5. Once the benches are bought, it takes time to buy new ones. What is important is to repair the broken ones. Only materials to repair broken ones will be bought.

The costs above are for either existing temporary structures or permanent structures in Urban areas where rent is not paid. However, at some time the SPARK curriculum community school may need its own permanent structures. To quantify the cost per learner is extremely difficult as the numbers of pupils per school fluctuates from time to time and from school to school. Some schools are small with few pupils while others are big with many pupils. If we agree that the biggest *community school in an urban area* has an average of 300 pupils, then *the cost per pupil is about K110,000 per year.*

Using the figures for a rural community school shown in Table 6, and if we agree that the biggest *community school in a rural area* has an average of 140 pupils, then *the cost per pupils is about K90,000 per year.*

In 2002 the following were the costs of the following structures built in Gwembe District by Save the Children Norway using Ministry of Education BESSIP plans:

- (a) 1 x 2 class room block K54 million
- (b) 2 staff houses K104 million

(c) 5 single VIP latrines K868,000

From 2004, the costs for such buildings in a rural setting are likely to treble in view of the escalating costs of building materials and transport costs in the country.

## **CHAPTER THIRTEEN: CO-OPERATING PARTNERS AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

In the context of this study co-operating partners are defined as organisations or institutions that directly or indirectly support community schools in Zambia. The support in whatever form may reach the community schools through ZCSS or ZOCS. Such partners include the Faith-based organisations, local and international NGOs, the donor community and individuals. The support coming to the community schools is normally in form of money, capacity building programmes, teacher-training, workshops, learning and teaching materials, human resource and technical assistance.

Among the co-operating partners that support community schools through ZCSS in the country are the following: ZECAB, in the field of capacity building through provision of bursaries to learners; Norwegian Church Aid, Stichting Porticus, German Technical Aid to Zambia (GTZ) and Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE) supporting community schools in various ways; Project Concern International (PCI) and World Food Programme (WFP), running the Feeding Programme where the two organisations are providing highly nutritious food to community school pupils, and the Ministry of Education whose support to community schools is seen in grants to the schools, training of community school teachers, seconding trained teachers to community schools and carrying out inspections of community schools.

Other co-operating partners are: UNICEF, the major supporter of community schools in Zambia; USAID, whose support is indirect through the IRI programme; Save the Children Norway (SCN), mainly in training community school teachers, provision of desks and occasionally supporting construction of classroom blocks in selected community schools as was the case two years ago in Gwembe Valley. Livingstone Street Children Association (LISCA), Hope for Children (UK), Lotary Anns, and European Union are all supporting community schools in many ways that enhance the general quality of education in community schools in Zambia.

## **CHAPTER FOURTEEN: FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE SPARK CURRICULUM IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN ZAMBIA**

The main motive of this study was to assess the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the SPARK curriculum in Community Schools in Zambia from 2000 to 2004. This chapter includes the summary of the main findings of the study.

The evaluation has revealed that:

1. As the SPARK curriculum stands today, it is only partially relevant and it is not suitable for the learning needs of the pupils in the community schools in the country. There are many reasons for this. First, the SPARK curriculum depends on only one document, the SPARK manual for delivery of lessons by teachers. In itself, the manual is not adequate. Second, the curriculum was suitable for the original target group (children above 9 years). Current age profile in community schools in the study area is from 6 – 8 years at Level 1. Thirdly, the non-availability of the SPARK manual in some community schools forced the teachers to follow the ZBEC curriculum. From the fieldwork and archival sources, it has been established that only 10% of the community schools are meant to be ‘SPARK curriculum community schools’, following the SPARK curriculum. The rest, or 90% of the community schools are using the Zambia Basic Education (ZBEC) curriculum.
2. On its own, the current SPARK curriculum is not effective in adequately providing the present learning needs of the learners in the SPARK community schools. The ineffectiveness lies in the inadequate content in the syllabus (SPARK manual) as compared to the ZBEC yet the same community school children are also expected to sit the same Grade 7 examination as those taught on the ZBEC curriculum. Also, 24 out of 33 of the teachers in this study, the users of the SPARK curriculum are not qualified to handle the SPARK manual because they have not been inducted or trained in its use. The content of the original SPARK curriculum was for the older children of the age range 9 to 16 years. Data from fieldwork as tabulated in Table 4 reveal that the same curriculum is now directed at the younger children of age range 7 to 14 years. One of the consequences of the inability of this curriculum is its failure to sufficiently facilitate entry of the ‘young age range’ community school children to Grade eight in government schools as indicated in Table 5. Having recognised the problem, some of the teachers in the SPARK community schools are unofficially using it together with the government ZBEC curriculum as a strategy to improve the learning needs of the pupils. Other schools are using it with IRI. Table 3 illustrates this point very well. Of the 12 *community schools* visited in the study area, 4 community schools are SPARK community schools; 6 community schools are Non-SPARK community schools; One community school is following *both* the *IRI* and *SPARK manual*; 3 community schools are following ZBEC only, and 2 community schools are following *both ZBEC and SPARK curricular*.
3. The impact of SPARK curriculum has not been positive in the **10%** community schools using the SPARK curriculum. This is because teachers, especially the untrained teachers do not find it user-friendly. The English language used in the SPARK manual is technical and at a higher level than the level of education for the teachers. This makes the manual difficult to be understood by many untrained community schoolteachers. Also, many community schoolteachers are not inducted in the use of the SPARK manual.
4. The cost for implementing the full SPARK curriculum community school varies between urban and rural areas. The average cost for the urban school is about K110,000 per learner per annum while that for the rural school is about K90,000 per pupil per year.
5. There is no Primary Reading Programme (PRP) in community schools.
6. There is an excellent relationship between SPARK curriculum and the Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI) in community schools visited in the study areas. It is also true for the

SPARK community schools in Lusaka and Mumbwa districts as disclosed by the EBS officials. The teachers in the IRI - SPARK community schools that the research team visited use IRI in addition to the SPARK manual. The IRI re-enforces the materials in the SPARK manual. The strong educational bond between the two has benefited many community schoolteachers, who have been trained by EBS in the use of the IRI teaching methodologies.

7. Parent Community School Committees (PCSCs), teachers and pupils in community schools would like the SPARK curriculum revised. The revised version should incorporate more material in the subject areas that are required for entry into Grade 8 to be at par with the government curriculum for Grades 1 to 7. The revised version of the SPARK curriculum will not only attract more community schoolteachers to use it more effectively but the incorporated materials and Pupils' Books will enhance the delivery of lessons. This is clearly a reflection of change of expectations by the *three main* stakeholders: parents, pupils and teachers.
8. When revising the SPARK curriculum, PCSCs, teachers, and pupils would like it to be extended from the current Levels 1 to 4 (Grades 1 to 7) to Grades 8 and 9. This means that they would like community schools to offer education up to the Upper Basic School level. This is also a clear reflection of change of expectations by the three main stakeholders: parents, pupils and teachers.
9. In the study areas visited, there is no community school that has a Skills Class for the Level 4 graduates. Pupils who do not succeed in the Grade 7 government examinations to proceed to Grade 8, go back to their communities and eventually return to life in the village. For those in urban areas, they return to the streets. Pupils who succeed to enter Grade 8 experience difficulties to acquire money for school requirements.
10. As revealed in Table 4 in Chapter Four, more younger children of school age or age range of 7 to 14 years are entering community schools than the older children of age range 9 to 16 years for which community schools were initially intended. The advantages of community schools are that they attract the vulnerable school age children to come to these schools. Also, the younger children come to community schools mainly with the view of pursuing academic education like others in government schools. The older children come to community schools with the view of acquiring certain competencies that would make them survive in their communities.
11. Community schools do not have their own Teacher Training College where to train their community schoolteachers. Lecturers in the government Teacher Training Colleges where community school teachers are trained are themselves not trained in SPARK curriculum teaching methodologies. Therefore, the trained teachers coming out of these Colleges are not competent to handle learners in the SPARK community schools. The curriculum in government Teacher Training Colleges where community school teachers train does not include community school concepts or teaching strategies or methodologies, hence the training is irrelevant to community school needs in their original conception.
12. ZCSS teacher training programmes for its teachers between 2000 and 2004 have had little impact in the community schools. Of the schools we visited in the study area during the fieldwork presented in Table 10 in Chapter Ten, only 9 out of 33 of the teachers are trained and 24 out of 33 of the teachers interviewed are untrained. They have never been inducted in the use of the SPARK curriculum and they have not been to any government Teacher Training College either.

13. Evidently, there has been a change in the philosophy of community schools in the country. Originally in 1996 community schools were to enrol only children in the age range of 9 to 16 years. They were not expected to write Grade 7 government examinations to enter Grade 8 but to proceed to a Skills Class after Level 4. The SPARK manual, which is the only curriculum for community schools was meant for the untrained teacher from the local community with either Grade 9 or Grade 12 school certificate. This is not what is obtaining on the ground. The expectations of the main stakeholders have changed and the philosophy has also changed as observed in the study area and documented in Chapters 4, 5 and 8.
14. There are gaps in the data on community schools at ZCSS. For example, there is no data pertaining to the number of Skills Classes, accurate number of registered community schools, data on all pupils by gender who qualify to enter Grade 8 annually, or data on the general post- Level 4 activities that pupils from SPARK community schools are engaged in.

## **CHAPTER FIFTEEN: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY**

In view of the findings presented in Chapter fourteen we recommend that:

1. The present SPARK curriculum and SPARK manual should be *phased out*. The 'phasing out' period should be one year beginning 2005. Other than literacy, numeracy and oracy mainly in local languages, most objectives of the SPARK curriculum in the SPARK curriculum community schools have not been achieved as explained in the *Introduction* of this report. For example, originally, the SPARK curriculum schools were not meant to enrol children under 9 years and the children were not meant to write Grade 7 examinations after Level 4, but to enter the Skills Class. However, from the fieldwork undertaken in the study area and the accompanying statistical data in Table 4 in Chapter Four and Table 5 in Chapter Five it is clear that children under 9 years of age are being enrolled and those in Level 4 write Grade 7 examinations. There are no Skills Classes for Level 4 graduates. All these confirm that most of the objectives, original policy and original philosophy have not been fulfilled in the SPARK curriculum community schools.
2. The existing bursary scheme in the Ministry of Education should be extended to the community school pupils who qualify to enter Grades 8 and 10. The children are from disadvantaged economic backgrounds and will not be able to raise the fees and other requisites for the government Upper Basic school that they originally avoided in the Lower and Middle Basic school.
3. In view of the first recommendation above, it is therefore not necessary to prepare a revised SPARK curriculum incorporating some of the content in the Upper Basic school syllabus as demanded by the Parent Community School Committees, community schoolteachers and community school pupils. The ZBEC curriculum should be adopted by the 10% community schools currently using the SPARK curriculum.

4. Since practical skills are crucial for the future of children in the community schools, we strongly recommend that unlike the current situation where there are no Skills Classes in the community schools in the country, Skills Classes should be established for graduates of Level 4 and Grade 9 and should be optional. The Skills Classes should be situated in carefully selected Provincial Zonal Centres and should be equipped with the necessary tools and qualified Industrial Arts teachers, Agricultural science teachers and Home Economics teachers. Alternatively, arrangements should be made with St. Paul's Skills Training College in Mazabuka to admit more students from community schools all over the country. This will require financial and technical assistance to expand the College.
5. ZCSS should organise Training Workshops for Lecturers in the government Teacher Training Colleges on the teaching methodologies specific to *all* community schools and the use of the Mentor's Guide (manual) and the EBS operations of the IRI Learning at Taonga Market Educational Radio Programme. The supplementary community school teaching methodologies should be mandatory for trainee teachers from community schools.
6. 6.All community schoolteachers should be trained in the Primary Reading Programme (PRP) teaching methodologies.
7. 7.ZCSS should institute short researches/consultancies to gather essential data on various aspects of community schools that are currently not available at the Secretariat as stated in the *Finding number 14* in the previous chapter. Also data on registration of community schools to be improved.

## **APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED**

### **LUSAKA**

Ms Harriet Miyato	–	Director, ZOCS
Mr. Chikapa	–	Education Advisor, ZOCS
Mrs. Munkombwe	–	ZOCS
Mrs. A. Masuwa	–	Administrative Manager, ZOCS

### **LIVINGSTONE**

Ms. Jenipher Mweemba	–	Pupils Libuyu Community School
Mr. Samuel Zulu	–	Pupil, Libuyu Community School
Ms. J. Samutumwa	-	Teacher Libuyu Community School
Mr. Moses Kayombo	-	Former pupil, Libuyu Community School
Ms. J. Kabundula	-	Teacher Libuyu Community School
Ms. Prona Miyoba	-	Former pupil, Libuyu Community School
Mr. Alex Mulope	-	Teacher, Libuyu Community School
Mrs. Loveness Sitali	-	Parent, Libuyu Community
Ms. Peggy Liyungu	-	Teacher, Libuyu Community School
Mr. Muyeba Muyeba	-	Parent, Libuyu Community
Mr. Cleble Mwandu	-	Parent, Libuyu Community
Mr. Emmanuel Mainza	-	Mapenzi Community School
Parents, Mapenzi Community	-	Mapenzi Community School
Pupils, Mapenzi Community School	-	Mapenzi Community School
Ms. Catherine Chilambe	-	Administrator, Linda Community School
Mr. Alvin Mubango	-	Director, Linda Community School
Ms. Karen Silembo	-	Teacher, Linda Community School
Ms. Edith Mumbi	-	Teacher, Linda Community School
Ms. Priscilla Phiri	-	Teacher, Linda Community School
Ms. Ruth Muzenga	-	Teacher/Mentor, Maanu Mbwami Community School/IRI Centre

- Ms. Petronella Jumo School/IRI - Teacher/Mentor, Maanu Mbwami Community Centre
- Mr. K. Mbozi - Save the Children Norway
- Ms. Lontia Chinkubala - Save the Children Norway
- Mr. Christopher Syamwenya - Former Southern Province Community Schools Focal Point Person/Lecturer, DLTTTC P.E.O Southern Province DEBS Livingstone District Principal, DLTTTC Former pupil, Skills Training, DLTTTC, Village west of the College.

### **MAZABUKA**

- Sister Angela Dally – Ndeke Community School, Co-ordinator
- Mrs. Rosemary Mwafulusi - Supervisor, Ndeke Community School
- Mrs. Judith Silwamba - Teacher, Ndeke Community School
- Mr. Elvis Chikamba - Teacher, Ndeke Community School
- Mr. Sheni Kaumba - Teacher, Ndeke Community School
- Ms. Roline Hatimbula - Teacher, Ndeke Community School
- Ms. Mavis Hamuntanga - Social Worker at the Drop-in-Centre
- Mrs. Betty Ndombe - Teacher
- Mrs. Rona Yoyo - Teacher
- Mr. Shyloty Shaungama - Metalwork Instructor
- Mr. Bornface Mwiinga - Woodwork Instructor
- Mr. Oscar Chandamundima - Teacher
- Brother P. E. Nolan - Principal, St. Paul's Skills Training College
- Brother Bernard Hayes - St. Edmonds Co-learning Services
- Mrs. Winnie S. Mubita - Head/Supervisor, Changachanga Community School
- Mrs. R. Banda - Teacher, Changachanga Community School
- Ms. R. Banda - Teacher, Changachanga Community School
- Mr. C. M'hango - Teacher, Changachanga Community School
- Mr. Charles Tembo - Head/Supervisor, Shimungalu Community School

Mr. R. Mweetwa - Teacher, Shimungalu Community School  
 Mrs. M. Cheelo - Teacher, Shimungalu Community School  
 Mr. Akapelwa - DEBS  
 Mr. Mainza Kaampa - ESO / OL  
 Ms. Evelyn Chewe - Mentor, Njomona Salvation Army IRI Centre  
 Ms. M. Tembo - Mentor, Njomona Catholic IRI Centre

**NDOLA**

Mrs. Dallenbarch - Dannish Volunteer/Co-ordinator, Barefoot/Chisankano  
 Community School  
 Mr. Kennedy Kazeze - Head Teacher, Barefoot/Chisankano Community  
 School  
 Mr. Salisho Chanda - Provincial Education Officer, Copperbelt Province

**MASAITI**

Mr. Binwell Kankobwe - Head Teacher, Michinka Community School  
 Mr. Stanley Pikila - Pupil, Michinka Community School  
 Mr. Albert Matolo - Kabambula Community School  
 Mr. K. Safeli - Masaiti District Resource Centre Co-ordinator  
 District Education Board Secretary - Masaiti DEBS Office  
 Mr. C. M. Chilindi - Former Copperbelt Community Schools Focal Point  
 Person

**MPONGWE**

Mr. M. Muhau - Head Teacher, Mulilantambo Community School

**KITWE**

Kitwe Teacher Training College - Vice Principal  
 Mr. Kennedy Develias Phiri - Co-ordinator, Oxfam Governance and Education  
 Project  
 Copperbelt Health Education Project - CHEP Office

## **KABWE**

- Mrs. Mukuyamba - Head/Supervisor, Buyantashi Community School
- Mr. Stanley Mulenga - Co-ordinator, Buyantashi Community School Teacher Training College Programme
- Mr. Kasalabushi - Lecturer, Buyantashi Community School Teacher Training Programme
- Ms. Chama - Lecturer, Buyantashi Community School Teacher Training Programme
- Mr. Mwandu - Lecturer, Buyantashi Community School Teacher Training Programme

## **LUANGWA**

- Mr. Kaira - District Education Board Secretary
- Mr. Longwa - District Education Standards Officer
- Mr. J. Msoni - Education Standards Officer (Special Education)
- Ms. Anne Kembo - Education Standards Officer (General)
- Mr. George Shakantu - Headmaster, Luangwa Basic School
- Mr. Nchimunya - Clerical Officer, DEBS Office
- Mr. Sebastian Tembo - Teacher, Kaluluzi Community school
- Mr. A. Tembo - Teacher, Chilombwe Community School
- Mr. G.J. Chirwa - Teacher, Chilombwe Community School
- Mr. M. Bambala - Teacher, Chilombwe Community School

## **CHONGWE**

- Mr. A.E. Simwaba - District Education Board Secretary

## **KAFUE**

- Ms Monde Masheke - Teacher, Kasenje Basic School
- Ms R.S. Makayi - Teacher, Kasenje Basic School

Mrs R.M. Chibalange	-	District Education Standards Officer
Ms Loveness Mubisi	-	Education Standards Officer (General)
Mrs. M. Ngwenya	-	Teacher, Kasenje Basic School
Ms. L. Shangala	-	Teacher, Kasenje Basic School
Mr. L.N. Nyambe	-	Headmaster, Kasenje Basic School
Mr. Roy M. Simauki	-	Nankanga Middle Basic School
Mr. Demmy Simataa	-	Nankanga Middle Basic School

**LUSAKA**

Mr. F. Hambote	-	Director, ZCSS
Mrs. J.M. Mubashi	-	Assistant Controller, EBS
Dr. C. Chipoma	-	Education Specialist, USAID
Mr. G.Tambulukani	-	Ministry of Education Primary Reading Programme Consultant, School of Education, University of Zambia.

**APPENDIX 2: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS**

**RELEVANCY, EFFECTIVENESS AND PROSPECT OF ATTRACTING FUTURE SUPPORT TO COMMUNITY SHOOOLS**

Target Group: SPARK Curriculum Community Schools

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS**

1. State the skills that you have acquired in the 4 years that you have been learning in this Community School.

.....  
.....  
.....

2. Competence: to ascertain competence levels attained in Community Schools to come from **Desk Review** of National Assessment, **ECZ** (See **Joe Kanyika**)

3. Do you know of any former pupils from this school who are in:

(a) Self employment?.....

(b) Formal employment?.....

4. (a) Would you encourage other children in similar circumstances to yours, to join a Community School?

.....

(b)Why? Explain.....

5. (a) Do you think the learning you have had has prepared you sufficiently to enter and learn Grades 8 and 9? .....

(b) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....

(c)How many pupils of this community school have proceeded to Grades 8 and 9?

Boys:.....

Girls:.....

(d) How many pupils of this community school have proceeded to Grades 10 up to 12?

Boys:.....

Girls:.....

6. According to the 1996 National Policy on Education, Basic Education goes up to Grade 9. The SPARK curriculum is designed to meet the needs of the terminal Primary Education from Grades 1 – 7 which is reflected in **Focus on Learning** (1992), but not the needs of Upper Basic Education, Grades 8 and 9.
  - (a) Do you think the SPARK curriculum covers the Basic School curriculum from Grades 8 and 9 articulated in the 1996 National Education Policy?.....
  - (b) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
  - (c) Do you think the SPARK curriculum adequately prepares children to enter Grades 8 – 9 Upper Basic Schools in Zambia?.....
  - (d) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
7. Should the SPARK curriculum be reviewed to better prepare children for entry to Grades 8 – 9?.....
8. Should the SPARK curriculum be extended to incorporate Grades 8 – 9 to meet the duration of Basic Education currently in Zambia?.....
9. Do you see any need to review the SPARK materials to incorporate Grades 8 and 9 work?.....
  - (a) Why? Explain.....

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS/COMMUNITY

1. Have you ever used your child from a Community School to write a letter for you?.....
  - (a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....  
.....
- 2  Have the skills from the Community School helped your child to find work or employment?.....
- 3  Do you want this Community School to continue in your area?.....
  - (a) Why? Explain.....
4. Do you think the learning your child has had in a Community School is sufficient preparation for his/her to enter and learn in Grades 8 and 9?.....
  - (b) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
5. According to the 1996 National Policy on Education, Basic Education goes up to Grade 9. The SPARK curriculum is designed to meet the needs of the terminal Primary Education from Grades 1 – 7 which is reflected in **Focus on Learning** (1992), but not the needs of Upper Basic Education, Grades 8 and 9.
6. Do you think the SPARK curriculum covers the Basic School curriculum from Grades 8 and 9 articulated in the 1996 National Education Policy?.....
7. If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
8. Do you think the SPARK curriculum adequately prepares children to enter Grades 8 – 9 Upper Basic Schools in Zambia?.....
  - (a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
9. Should the SPARK curriculum be reviewed to better prepare children for entry to Grades 8 and 9?.....
10. Should the SPARK curriculum be extended to incorporate Grades 8 – 9 to meet the duration of Basic Education currently in Zambia?.....
11. Do you see any need to review the SPARK materials to incorporate Grades 8 and 9 work?.....
  - (a) Why? Explain.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNERS SUPPORTING COMMUNITY SCHOOLS  
(ZOCS, BOCS (Kabwe), CHURCH ORGANISATIONS AND NGOs)**

1. How many Community School graduates have you ever employed?.....

(a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....

*NOTE: Employment of one or more community school graduates by supporting partners  
is indicative of their confidence in Community School Education.*

2. Do you know any formal organisation that has employed graduates from Community Schools?.....

3. State the number of Community School graduates that you know who are working in their communities after leaving school.....

4. Would your organisation be prepared to employ a Community School graduate as a Telephone operator or Office orderly?.....

(a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....

5. According to the 1996 National Policy on Education, Basic Education goes up to Grade 9. The SPARK curriculum is designed to meet the needs of the terminal Primary Education from Grades 1 – 7 which is reflected in **Focus on Learning** (1992), but not the needs of Upper Basic Education, Grades 8 and 9.

6. Do you think the SPARK curriculum covers the Basic School curriculum from Grades 8 and 9 articulated in the 1996 National Education Policy?.....

(a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....

7. Do you think the SPARK curriculum adequately prepares children to enter Grades 8 – 9 Upper Basic Schools in Zambia?.....

(a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....

8. Should the SPARK curriculum be reviewed to better prepare children for entry to Grades 8 – 9?.....

9. Should the SPARK curriculum be extended to incorporate Grades 8 – 9 to meet the duration of Basic Education currently in Zambia?.....

10. Do you see any need to review the SPARK materials to incorporate Grades 8 and 9 work?.....

(a) Why? Explain.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

1. Is training before using the SPARK manual necessary for teachers?.....  
(a) Explain.....
2. Where do Community School teachers train to use the SPARK manual?.....  
.....
3. How readily available is the SPARK manual?.....  
(a) Why does your school use the SPARK manual?.....  
(b) Is it necessary to have a **Pupils Book** for Community Schools following the SPARK curriculum?.....  
(c) Explain.....  
(d) From your experience in using the SPARK manual, do you think it is sufficient to cater for all the children’s learning needs in 4 years?.....  
(e) What problems if any, have you found in using the SPARK manual to cover the seven year Primary Course (Grades 1 – 7)?.....
8. Do you find the SPARK manual sufficient to teach all the subject areas in the school curriculum?.....
9. Do you see any need to have reference books for teachers for respective subject areas contained in the SPARK manual?.....  
(a) Why? Explain.....
10. How many pupils of this community school have proceeded to Grades 8 and 9?  
Boys:.....  
Girls:.....
11. How many pupils of this community school have proceeded to Grades 10 up to 12?  
Boys:.....  
Girls:.....
12. (a) Of late the age-range of pupils in Community Schools is from 7 years to 20 years learning in one class or level. Between the younger children (7 – 15 years) and the older children (16 – 20 years), which group easily copes with the SPARK curriculum?.....  
(b) If the 7-15 year age group easily copes with the SPARK curriculum, what is your advice?.....

- (c) If the 7 – 15 year age group finds it difficult to cope with the SPARK curriculum, what is your advice?.....
  - (d) If the 16-20 year age group easily copes with the SPARK curriculum, what is your advice?.....
  - (e) If the 16 – 20 year age group finds it difficult to cope with the SPARK curriculum, what is your advice?.....
13. Between the two groups:
- (a) 7 – 15 year age group
  - (b) 16 – 20 year age group
14. Which performs better in the Grade 7 public examinations after doing the four year SPARK curriculum?.....
15. The age range in Community Schools is currently 7-20 years. The SPARK Curriculum is designed for children in the age group 16-20 years but not 7 – 15 years. Clearly the SPARK is designed for children of 16 and above mental development. The 7-15 years age group are disadvantaged by the SPARK manual.
16. Do you find any difficulties using the SPARK manual to teach children whose age range is from 7-20 in One Level or Class?.....
17. Explain how you go round this problem if at all you have or face it?.....
18. Do you think it is necessary for SPARK manual to be revised and simplified according to the different mental ages of pupils?.....
- (a) Explain.....
19. Community Schools are known to use integration of subjects as a teaching strategy or methodology.
- (a) What do you know about this teaching methodology?.....
  - (b) Do you find this methodology effective in meeting your teaching/learning objectives?  
.....
  - (c) If this methodology gives problems, what are your suggestions?.....
21. Do you think the pupils following the SPARK curriculum should sit a SPARK National examination and be certified?.....
22. What purpose will a SPARK National examination serve?.....

23. (a) At the end of level 4, should graduates of the SPARK curriculum go on into a skills training centre or classes before they settle in their communities?.....
24. Do skills classes or centres exist in all Community Schools after level 4?.....
- (a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
25. What happens to graduates after level 4 who do not have the necessary skills and competencies to work in the communities?.....
26. Indicate the age range, sex and disabled children according to the levels in your school:

Level	Age Range		Sex		S SEN pupils	Total
		F	M	F	M	
1						
2						
3						
4						
Skills Class						

27. What is the class size (enrolment) in each of these levels?.....
28. What is the official class size of a Community School according to ZCSS?.....
29. Why do some parents send their children to Community School instead of government school?.....
30. State five advantages of Community Schools over government schools... (a)..... (b)..... (c)..... (d)..... (e).....
31. According to the 1996 National Policy on Education, Basic Education goes up to Grade 9. The SPARK curriculum was designed to meet the needs of the terminal Primary Education from Grades 1 – 7 which is reflected in **Focus on Learning** (1992).
32. Do you think the SPARK curriculum adequately prepares children to enter Grades 8 – 9 Upper Basic Schools in Zambia?.....
- (a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
33. Should the SPARK curriculum be reviewed to better prepare children for entry to Grades 8 – 9?.....
34. Should the SPARK curriculum be extended to incorporate Grades 8 – 9 to meet the

- duration of Basic Education currently in Zambia?.....
35. Do you see any need to review the SPARK materials to incorporate Grades 8 and 9 work?.....
- (a) If the answer is negative. Why? Explain.....
36. (a) Does the SPARK manual make your lessons and teaching easier?.....
- (b) Explain.....
37. Do your pupils defect to government schools before completing the four levels of the SPARK curriculum?.....
38. Do you think the reason for your pupils defecting to government schools is because they are not satisfied with the content and quality of the SPARK curriculum?.....
37. Do you think the government free education policy at Lower and Middle Basic School level is more influential than the content and quality of the SPARK curriculum in luring Community School pupils to government schools?.....
38. What should be done to discourage Community School pupils from running away to government schools?.....
39. What should be done to improve the content and quality of the SPARK curriculum?  
.....  
.....
40. Ministry of Education Colleges have a special arrangement to give training to 100 Community School teachers per year.
- (a) Indicate how the College Teacher Training syllabus you attended addresses community school concept? .....
- .....
- .....
- (b) Indicate how your College Syllabus addresses community school methodology
- (c) Do you think the training (skills and competencies) your College provides to Community School teachers is relevant to the needs of Community School
- (a)Pupils?.....  
.....
- (b)Teaching?.....  
.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROVINCIAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL CO-ORDINATOR/FOCAL POINT PERSON**

1. Do you think the skills and competencies Community Schools give are useful to:

- (a) Pupils?.....
- (b) Parents?.....
- (c) Communities?.....

2. Explain your position in respect of each group (i.e how are they useful)

- (a).....
- (b).....
- (c).....

3. What is the link between the Community Schools and the Government

Schools?.....  
.....

4. What is the link between Community Schools and the Community?.....

5 Do you think the SPARK curriculum and manual are sufficient to prepare pupils enter and learn in Grades 8 and 9?.....

6. List the shortcomings of the SPARK curriculum and manual.....

- (a) SPARK Curriculum.....
- (b) SPARK Manual.....

7. Which skills and competencies outside the SPARK Manual should Community Schools teach?.....

8 Ministry of Education Colleges have a special arrangement to give training to 100 Community School teachers per year.

(a) Indicate how the College Teacher Training syllabus addresses community school concepts? .....

(b)Indicate how your College Syllabus addresses community school methodology...

9.Do you think the training (skills and competencies) your College provides to Community School teachers is relevant to the needs of Community School

(a)Pupils?.....

(b)Teaching?.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROVINCIAL MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OFFICIAL**

1. Do you think the skills and competencies Community Schools give are useful to:
  - (a) Pupils?.....
  - (b) Parents?.....
  - (c) Communities?.....
  
2. Explain your position in respect of each group (i.e how are they useful)
  - (a).....
  - (b).....
  - (c).....
  
3. What is the link between the Community Schools and the Government Schools?.....  
.....
  
4. What is the link between Community Schools and the Community?.....
  
5. Do you think the SPARK curriculum and manual are sufficient to prepare pupils enter and learn in Grades 8 and 9?.....
  
8. List the shortcomings of the SPARK curriculum and manual.....
  - (a) SPARK Curriculum.....
  - (c) SPARK Manual.....
  
9. Which skills and competencies outside the SPARK Manual should Community Schools teach?  
.....  
.....  
.....
  
- 8 Ministry of Education Colleges have a special arrangement to give training to 100 Community School teachers per year.
  - (a) Indicate how the College Teacher Training syllabus addresses community school concepts? .....
  - (b) Indicate how your College Syllabus addresses community school methodology.....
  
9. Do you think the training (skills and competencies) your College provides to Community School teachers is relevant to the needs of Community School

- (a) Pupils?.....  
.....
- (b) Teaching?.....  
.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION DISTRICT OFFICIAL AND RESOURCE CENTRE CO-ORDINATORS**

1. Do you think the skills and competencies Community Schools give are useful to:
  - (a) Pupils?.....
  - (b) Parents?.....
  - (c) Communities?.....
2. Explain your position in respect of each group (i.e how are they useful)
  - (a).....
  - (b).....
  - (c).....
3. What is the link between the Community Schools and the Government Schools?.....
4. What is the link between Community Schools and the Community?.....
- 5 Do you think the SPARK curriculum and manual are sufficient to prepare pupils enter and learn in Grades 8 and 9?.....
- 6 List the shortcomings of the SPARK curriculum and manual.....
  - (a)SPARK Curriculum.....
  - (b) SPARK manual.....
- 7.Which skills and competencies outside the SPARK manual should Community Schools teach?.....
8. Ministry of Education Colleges have a special arrangement to give training to 100 Community School teachers per year.
  - (a) Indicate how the College Teacher Training syllabus addresses community school concepts? .....
  - (b) Indicate how your College Syllabus addresses community school methodology.....
9. Do you think the training (skills and competencies) your College provides to Community School teachers is relevant to the needs of Community School

(a)Pupils?.....

.....

(b)Teaching?.....

.....

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IRI SCHOOLS/CENTRES MENTORS

1. When did the school/centre start?.....
2. Why was the school/centre started in this community?.....
3. Who manages the centre?.....
4. Who owns the school?.....
5. What are the academic and professional qualifications of the teachers?

Teacher		Qualifications	
Male	Female	Academic	Professional

6. Where are your teachers trained?.....

7. What curriculum do you follow?.....

8. How many pupils do you have by level/Grade/age range or sex?

Level	Age Range	Sex		SEN Pupils		Total
		F	M	F	M	
1						
2						
3						
4						

9. What text books do you use?.....
10. What skills and competencies do you teach your pupils?.....
11. How do you teach in your classes?.....
12. (a) Would you like to continue teaching up to Grade 7 using this IRI curriculum  
 (b) What is the relationship between your school and government school?  
 .....
13. What is the relationship between your school and the Community School in your area?.....  
 .....
14. (a) Do you think your school is better than a Community School?.....  
 (b) Explain.....  
 (c) What is the average distance between your school and the community?.....
15. Are you visited by any School Inspectors/officials from:
16. Ministry of Education.....
  - a. Community.....
  - b. Church.....
17. (a) Would you be happy if your school and the Community School became one school?  
 (b) Explain.....  
 .....
18. What advantages does your school have over the Community School?.....  
 .....
19. What incentives do you get from the community for teaching here?.....
20. List the support you need to improve on your teaching strategies.....
21. What suggestions do you have for improving teaching methods in IRI centres  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IRI SCHOOL/CENTRE GRADE 4/5 PUPILS**

1. What skills and competencies do you learn at this centre? .....
2. How do your teachers teach you?.....
3. (a) Would you like to continue teaching up to Grade 7 using this IRI curriculum  
(b) What is the relationship between your school and government school?
4. What is the relationship between your school and the Community School in your area?.....
5. (a) Do you think your school is better than a Community School?.....  
(b) Explain.....
6. What is the average distance between your school and the community?.....
7. Are you visited by any School Inspectors/officials from:
8. Ministry of Education.....  
(a) Community.....  
(b) Church.....
9. (a) Would you be happy if your school and the Community School became one school?.....  
(b) Explain.....  
.....
10. What advantages does your school have over the Community School?.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NON-SPARK COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: TEACHERS**

1. Why don't you use the SPARK manual?.....
2. If you do not use the SPARK manual, what do you use?.....
3. What curriculum do you follow?.....
4. What teaching methodologies do you use?.....
5. What advantages if any does the non-SPARK Community School have over those following SPARK?.....
6. What levels or Grades do you have?.....
7. Do your pupils write Grade 7 examinations at the end of the levels?.....
8. What competencies and skills do your pupils acquire from your curriculum?
  - (a) Competencies:.....  
.....
  - (b) Skills:.....  
.....
9. What is the relevance of the education you offer using your curriculum to:
  - (a) pupils.....
  - (b) parents.....
  - (c) community.....
10. Where do your pupils work after completing school?.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL TEACHERS**

**TARGET: PRINCIPALS: David Livingstone Teachers College and Buyantashi Open Community Schools (BOCS, Kabwe) and ZOCS**

1. How do you recruit student teachers?.....
2. What skills do you teach?.....
3. How long is your teacher training?.....
4. Who certifies your teachers?.....
5. What incentives do you give to trained teachers?.....
6. Does your training include elements of the SPARK manual?.....
7. List the elements you include from SPARK manual/curriculum.....
8. Do you train instructors for the special skills SPARK classes?.....
9. How long is the duration of this training for instructors?.....
10. When did training of teachers in SPARK start?.....
11. Who sponsors the training?.....

12. Indicate names, sex, qualification and area of specialisation for your lecturers

Name	Sex		Qualification	Specialisation
	F	M		

13. How many teachers has the college trained by sex since inception?  
 Male:.....  
 Female:.....
14. What is current total enrolment by sex and level of training (ie first year, second year etc)?
15. What is the potential for continued training of Community school teachers for

(a) class room teaching

(b) skills classes

16. Ministry of Education colleges have a special arrangement to give training to 100 community school teachers per year.

(a) Indicate how your Teacher Training College addresses community school concepts

1.....

2.....

3.....

4.....

5.....

(b) Indicate how your college syllabus addresses community school methodology

.....  
.....  
.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON FULL COST OF IMPLEMENTING SPARK**

**TARGET GROUP: SUPPORTING PARTNERS/COMMUNITIES/PARENTS/NGOs**

1. Indicate the different costs involved in running a full SPARK Curriculum Community School?.....  
.....

2. What is the cost of supporting a full Community School comprising 4 Levels with Skills Class per year?.....

3. What is the cost of running a Skills Class per year?.....

Questions 4 and 5 for Community/Parents:

List the different ways in which you support your Community School.

(a).....per week/month/year

(b).....per week/month/year

(c).....per week/month/year

- (d).....per week/month/year
  - (e).....per week/month/year
  - (f).....per week/month/year
  - (g).....per week/month/year
  - (h).....per week/month/year
  - (i).....per week/month/year
  - (j).....per week/month/year
4. (a) Do you receive any external support from any organisation?.....
- (b) List the type of support you receive from the same source support per year?

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EBS (MOE) OFFICIAL ON IRI SCHOOL/CENTRE**

1. What skills and competencies do your teachers (Mentors) teach the learners in the Centres? .....
2. (a) What is the relationship between the IRI centre/school and government school?.....
- (b)What is the relationship between the IRI centre/school and the Community School? .....
3. What is the average distance between the IRI centre/school and the community?.....
4. (a) Do officials from your institution (EBS) visit the IRI centres?.....
- (b) How often (number of visits per week/month) do they visit the centres?.....
- (c) How often do they visit the communities where there are IRI centres?.....
- 5 (a) Would you be happy if the IRI centres and the Community Schools came together as one and provided the same services together to the same communities?.....
- (b) Explain.....

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRP

### Target Group: DEBS; ESO (Community School Co-ordinator); HEAD TEACHERS OF GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

1. Do government Schools in your District teach PRP?
  - (a) YES.....
  - (b) NO.....
2. Do Community Schools in your District teach PRP?
  - (a) YES.....
  - (b) NO.....
3. Do Community Schools in your District have the Government SPARK curriculum?
  - (a) YES.....
  - (b) NO.....
4. Do Community Schools in your District have a SPARK curriculum from the ZCSS Secretariat?
  - (a) YES.....
  - (b) NO.....
5. Do the Community Schools in your District follow the Community School curriculum from their Secretariat (ZCSS)?
  - (a) YES.....
  - (b) NO.....
6. (a) Do your Standards Officers ensure that the SPARK curriculum from the Community Schools Secretariat is followed if any?.....
  - (b) If the answer is negative, explain.....
7. Do your Standards Officers ensure that the PRP government curriculum is followed in Community School?.....
  - (a) If the answer is negative, explain.....
8. Do you expect Community School pupils who do not follow the government curriculum to write Grade seven government examinations?.....

- (a) If the answer is negative explain.....
- 9. What is your advice on this problem?.....

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRP**

**Target Group: COMMUNITY SCHOOLTEACHERS: SPARK AND NON-SPARK**

- 1. Does your school have a government designed SPARK curriculum which you follow?  
 YES..... NO.....
- 2. Does your Community School have a SPARK curriculum from the ZCSS Secretariat which you follow?  
 YES..... NO.....
- 3. Explain your answer:.....
- 4. Does your Community School teach PRP?  
 YES..... NO.....
- 5. What are the branches or units that make up PRP?  
 (a).....  
 (b).....  
 (c).....  
 (d).....  
 (e).....
- 6. Indicate the different methodologies or steps you use in class in teaching the following:
- 7. NBTL.....  
 .....
- 8. SITE.....  
 .....
- 9. ROC.....  
 .....

10. Prepare a 40-minute lesson plan using PRP for any Grade, but indicate the Grade clearly.
11. (Attach the Lesson Plan to the questionnaire)
12. Indicate the different methodologies or steps you actually use in class in teaching using SPARK methodologies
13. ....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
14. Prepare a 40-minute lesson plan using SPARK teaching methods for any level, but indicate the level clearly. (Attach the SPARK Lesson Plan)

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MULTIGRADE TEACHING METHODOLOGIES**

Target Group: DEBS AND ESO

1. Name the Teacher Training Colleges in Zambia that train teachers in Multi-grade methodology.....  
 .....
2. Do your Teacher Training College Syllabuses cover Multi-grade teaching methodologies?  
 YES..... NO.....  
 List  
 (a) Government schools in your District that teach multi-grade?  
 .....  
 .....  
 (b) Community Schools in your District that teach Multi-grade  
 .....  
 .....
3. What is the link between government multiGrade schools and Community Schools?  
 .....
4. List the different ways government multiGrade schools help Community schools.

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE MULTIGRADE TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

### Target Group: Teachers in Community and Government Schools

1. Do you have multi-grade teaching in your school? YES..... NO.....
2. Do you use multi-grade teaching methodologies in your class? YES..... NO.....
3. Indicate the different methodologies or steps you use in a multi-grade lesson.  
.....
4. What is the link between government multi-grade schools and Community Schools?  
.....  
.....
5. List the different ways government multi-grade schools help Community schools.  
.....  
.....
6. Prepare a 40-minute Lesson Plan using multiGrade teaching methods in your class. Indicate clearly the Grades/levels of different pupils. (Attach the Lesson Plan).

### APENDIX 3: REPORT ON THE FIELD ASSESSMENT

The research team visited a number of places to gather data. The main study areas visited were Ndola, particularly Masaiti district; Livingstone district, Lusaka and Mazabuka districts. Subsidiary study areas visited included Kabwe, Luangwa, Chongwe and Kafue districts. See Appendix A for details of the districts visited.

The research team conducted in-depth group interviews with selected Level 4 pupils, teachers and parents in the school premises. Questionnaires meant for teachers and pupils were also administered to them. We also had interviews with the School Supervisors/Directors. Appendix A shows the schools visited and the teachers, pupils and parents interviewed.

In-depth interviews were also conducted with District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS), District Standards Officers (DESO), Education Standard Officers (ESO), Provincial Focal Point Persons and Provincial Education Officers (PEO). The officers were also given the appropriate questionnaires to complete.

Besides the government officials in schools, at the district and at provincial level, we also had in-depth interviews with a number of officials from local and international Non-governmental Organisations. These are also indicated in Appendix A.

The Field Assessments we had undertaken were very successful indeed. The respondents co-operated very well and answered the questions very well. We were very happy with the whole fieldwork.

We had no problems with the actual interviews and the administration of the questionnaires. The difficulties were with the number of days to be spent in the field. It was clear that we underestimated the amount of work in the field. We should have added an extra day for each study area we visited.

The other problems we faced were to do with the appointments in the rural community schools. Most of them are in very remote areas from the district centres and making appointments took time. The roads to the schools are also in very deplorable condition making driving very difficult.

Finally, it is important to note that the TAIWO drivers are very well trained. They are on time and take instructions. Their driving skills are excellent.

#### **APPENDIX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**The following were the Terms of Reference for this study:**

##### **Work Assignment**

1. Serve as the Lead Consultant to work with another Consultant
  - a) Desk Review
  2. Identification and collection of documents from ZCSS and ZOCS and other relevant partners on use of SPARK.
  3. Analysis of data on distribution of pupils by age in SPARK and non-SPARK community schools and formal basic schools, using the ZCSS database and EMIS data
  4. Analyse differences between SPARK and non-SPARK community schools using available information, such as the 2003 situation analysis and the 2003 national assessment of learning achievement.
  5. Review the SPARK training programme that has been implemented.
  - b) Duty-Bearer Interviews
  6. Conduct interviews with relevant stakeholders at national level, such as ZCSS, ZOCS, PRP, MOE, HQ curriculum Development Centre (CDC), Education Broadcast Services (EBS), UNICEF and other partners on the need for community schools, the skills and competences that community schools should develop, and the different curricula.
  - c) Field Assessment
  8. Select geographical focus for the study; Lusaka district in Lusaka province and Mazabuka district in Southern Province which were the first ones to introduce SPARK; moreover the rural Masaiti district in Copperbelt Province and Livingstone District in Southern Province are suggested as areas with both SPARK and non-SPARK schools. In each of

these four districts a sample of schools will be selected for the field assessment. The schools should cover community Schools: Using SPARK; not using SPARK, with IRI centres; without IRI centres; using the PRP; not using the PRP. Moreover it should be ensured that all the four groups of schools mentioned in the Background section (page 2-3) are included.

9. Conduct field assessment using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies (including listening to the voices of both right-holders – children – and duty – bearers – parents, teachers, others – on the quality of services through interviews)
10. Conduct interviews with teachers and PCSCs on the role of the community school in providing skills and competencies to the pupils.
11. Conduct interviews with teachers and PCSCs on the use of SPARK and reasons for (not) using the SPARK curriculum.
12. Conduct interviews with pupils on the role of the community school in providing skills and competencies to the pupils.
13. Conduct interviews with pupils on their view on SPARK and skills classes (only in schools using SPARK).
14. Conduct interviews with Ministry of Education officials at district and provincial level on the role of the community school in providing skills and competencies to the pupils.
15. Conduct interview with Ministry of Education officials at district and provincial level on the use of SPARK
16. Conduct interview with Ministry of Education officials at district and provincial level on the affordability and limitations of SPARK.

## APPENDIX 5: ACRONYMS

BOCC	-	Buyantashi Open Community College
C S	-	Community School
DEBS	-	District Education Board Secretary
DESO	-	District Education Standards Officer
DLTTC	-	David Livingstone Teacher Training College
EBS	-	Education Broadcasting Services
ECCDE	-	Early Childhood, Care, Development Education
ESO	-	Education Standards Officer
FPP	-	Focal Point Person
GTZ	-	German Technical Aid to Zambia
IRI	-	Interactive Radio Instruction
LICAP	-	Livingstone Community Action Project
LISCA	-	Livingstone Street Children Association
MOE	-	Ministry of Education
NBTL	-	New Breakthrough to Literacy
PCI	-	Project Concern International
PCSC	-	Parent Community School Committee
PESO	-	Provincial Education Standards Officer
PRP	-	Primary Reading Programme
RNE	-	Royal Netherlands Embassy
ROC	-	Reading on Course
SCN	-	Save the Children, Norway
SEN	-	Special Education Needs
SITE	-	Step into English
SPARK	-	Skills, Participation, Access to Relevant Knowledge
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development

WFP	-	World Food Programme
ZATEC	-	Zambia Teacher Education Course
ZBEC	-	Zambia Basic Education Course
ZCSS	-	Zambia Community Schools Secretariat
ZECAB	-	Zambia Education Capacity Building Programme
ZOCS	-	Zambia Open Community School

## APPENDIX 6: BIBLIOGRAPHY

**MOE.** *Ministry of Education Policy and Guidelines for the Development of Community Schools in Zambia. Report of the Task Force.* Lusaka: MOE, 2001.

**Mwansa, D.M.** *Community Schools: Strengths and Weaknesses, Pupil and Teacher Profiles.* Lusaka: UNICEF&ZCSS, 1998.

**Sinda, Vengi.** *A report on selected community schools field visits in the [Central] Province conducted from 28<sup>th</sup> January 2004 to 6<sup>th</sup> February 2004.* Lusaka: ZCSS, 2004.

**ZCSS.** *Activity Report for the period January to March 2004 [First Quarter 2004]*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Summary Report on Community Schools registration, 2004.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Annual Work Plan for 2004: January to December.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Report on the Field trip to Northern and Luapula Provinces, February 2004.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Community Schools Movement in Zambia. Strategic Plan 2002 – 2006. February 2003.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Report on the Workshop held at Choma Resource Centre, 15<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> September 2003.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Sensitisation and Planning Workshop from the 5<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> November 2003.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Sample Survey of Community School Education in Zambia. December 2003.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Community Schools in Zambia. Provincial Statistics 1999 and 2000. November 2000.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Background and objectives of the Kafue Gorge Workshop in 1996.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Community Schools Movement in Zambia. Strategic Plan 2002 – 2006. 13<sup>th</sup> June 2001.*

**ZOCS.** *Zambia Open Community Schools (ZOCS) Education Programme (2004 – 2006). 2004.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *ZOCS Hope through Education. Annual Report 2003.*